

1955

Section 5 provides that if the Commissioners obtain a bond for a notary public whose notarial duties are confined solely to District of Columbia business, then the bond obtained by the Commissioners shall be in lieu of that required by law.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file the conference report on the judges' salary bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 920)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Tax Court, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the fourth sentence of the sixth paragraph of section 6 of the Act entitled 'An Act to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia,' to be known as 'The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia,' to create 'The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia,' and for other purposes," approved April 1, 1942, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 11-711), is amended by striking out '\$14,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$19,000', and by striking out '\$14,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$18,500'.

"Sec. 2. The fourth sentence of section 2 of such Act of April 1, 1942, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 11-753), is amended by striking out '\$13,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$18,000', and by striking out '\$13,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$17,500'.

"Sec. 3. The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 27-2402), is amended by striking out '\$13,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$17,500'.

"Sec. 4. The last sentence of section 19 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia (D. C. Code, sec. 11-920) is amended to read as follows: 'The salary of the judge shall be \$17,500 per annum.'

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

JOHN L. McMILLAN,
OREN HARRIS,
SID SIMPSON,
JOS. P. O'HARA,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WAYNE MORSE,
ALAN BIBLE,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Tax Court, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The first section of the Senate bill increased the salary of the chief judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia from \$14,500 to \$20,000 per annum, and the salaries of the judges of such court from \$14,000 per annum to \$19,500 per annum. The corresponding section of the House amendment provided an increase to \$17,500 for the chief judges and to \$17,000 for the judges of such court. The conference agreement fixes the salary of the chief judge to be \$19,000 and the salaries of the judges to be \$18,500.

Section 2 of the Senate bill increased the salary of the chief judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia from \$13,500 per annum to \$19,000 per annum, and the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court from \$13,000 per annum to \$18,500 per annum. The corresponding section of the House amendment provided an increase to \$16,500 for the chief judge and to \$16,000 for the judges of such court. The conference agreement fixes the salary of the chief judge of such court to be \$18,000 per annum and the salaries of the judges to be \$17,500.

Section 3 of the Senate bill (which corresponds to section 4 of the House amendment and the conference substitute) established the salary of the judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia at \$18,500 per annum. Under existing law the salary of such judge is fixed under the Classification Act of 1949, and is at present \$11,800 per annum. The House amendment provided that the salary of the judge of the Juvenile Court should be \$14,800. The conference agreement fixes the salary of such judge to be \$17,500.

Section 4 of the Senate bill (which corresponds to section 3 of the House amendment and the conference substitute) increased the salary of the judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court from \$13,000 per annum to \$18,500 per annum. The House amendment increased the salary of such judge to \$16,000. The conference agreement fixes the salary of such judge to be \$17,500.

JOHN L. McMILLAN,
OREN HARRIS,
SID SIMPSON,
JOS. P. O'HARA,

Managers on the Part of the House.

MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 286) providing for the consideration of H. R. 6829, a bill to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of this bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations,

and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted; and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule as the reading would indicate providing for 3 hours of general debate and then the reading of the bill in Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule for amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important piece of legislation. It is very extensive in its scope. I wonder at times whether we really appreciate the full significance of these tremendous authorizations and appropriations. This one bill authorizes the expenditure of more money than possibly the cost of running this entire Government during the first 25 years of its existence.

The bill is divided into five titles and it proposes to provide construction and other related authority for the military departments within and outside the United States and for the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. Speaker, the total authorization in this bill is for the sum of \$2,368,998,900.

Breaking this figure down, Mr. Speaker, the Army would be given a total authorization of \$551,105,000. This would be further broken down so that \$238,778,000 would be allotted for use inside continental United States. The sum of \$78,334,000 would be authorized for outside the United States, while \$223,993,000 would be authorized for classified use by the Army and \$10 million would be authorized for emergencies.

The authorization for the Navy in this bill would be \$596,140,900, of which \$331,607,200 is proposed to be spent in continental United States while \$107,191,300 is to be spent outside the country. The classified allocation for the Navy is \$151,342,400 while the sum of \$6 million is proposed to be authorized for emergency use by the Navy.

The Air Force has received the largest authorization, for its total in H. R. 6829 is \$1,165,453,000. Out of this sum it is proposed that \$709,480,000 be allocated for expenditure within continental United States while \$450,973,000 would be spent outside of continental United States, and finally \$5 million would be set aside for emergency use.

Title IV of the bill would provide the sum of \$300,000 to be allocated, if authorized, for the use of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, while title V proposes to authorize the sum of \$56 million for the Central Intelligence Agency. This all makes the grand total of \$2,368,998,900.

I think it is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the report indicates that the Army authorization this year, if

June 27

passed, would be more than twice the authorization of \$236,060,000 which was granted for fiscal year 1955.

There are several interesting points which the membership of the House may wish to be especially cognizant of in title II; that is, the section dealing with the Navy authorization. First of all the bill proposes to authorize the development of two new installations, which, according to the report, are needed in order to provide advanced training for Naval and Marine Corps aircraft pilots. One of the new installations would be in southern Louisiana and the other would be in southern Texas.

H. R. 6829 proposes to authorize the relocation of the aviation training facilities at the Naval Academy to another site near Annapolis since the present site is considered inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, the report indicates that a program of aviation flight clearance is proposed in this bill, which is necessitated by the development of heavier and faster jet planes. These planes need an extremely wide turning area in order to simulate the conditions under which they must land on carriers at sea.

The Air Force authorization would include moneys to be spent on the construction of facilities of 255 important bases, of which 151 would be in the area of continental United States and 104 outside of continental United States. According to the report on the bill, Mr. Speaker, the authorization for the Air Force is in line with the effort of the Air Force to build a 137-wing Air Force. The bill includes the authorization for two new Air Defense Command bases, one of which would be at Fort Myers, Fla., and the other to be some place near Milwaukee, Wis. The bill also proposes facilities for five new locations in the United States Air Force in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6829 proposes the addition of a new installation for the Army at the West Coast Ammunition Terminal in California; the addition of 3 new installations for the Navy and 2 new installations for the Air Force. The two new installations for the Air Force I have mentioned above, but the new Navy installations would be at Port Isabel, Tex., New Iberia, La., and at Annapolis, Md.

The Committee on Armed Services added three new authorizations which were not included in the original proposal from the Department of Defense and these are first, \$8 million for an Army hospital at Camp Jackson, S. C.; \$16,900,000 for the Naval Air Facility near Annapolis; and \$7,500,000 for an addition to Bancroft Hall at the Naval Academy and for fill to provide land area an authorization of \$3,785,000 is given.

Title IV. Mr. Speaker, specifically would authorize the construction or rehabilitation of five units of housing, a communication facility, and some other items for the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and certain commissioned officers and enlisted personnel attached to his staff.

The report points out that each of the Chiefs of Staff is provided with appropriate quarters but that this has never

been done for the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. Speaker, authority is granted in this bill for the acquisition of large areas of lands which I think should be called to the attention of the House membership. Under the authorization contained in this bill, if passed the Army could acquire some 55,814 acres of land within the United States at a cost of \$7,773,000, while in Okinawa some 52,088 acres may be acquired at a cost of \$30,500,000.

The Navy would be authorized to acquire some 54,000 acres—fee—and some 138,000 acres—easement—at a total cost of \$33,444,000.

The Air Force under the provisions of the bill, as reported from the Committee on Armed Services, would authorize the acquisition of some 16,800 acres—fee—and 23,000 acres—easement—at a cost of \$9,900,000 while mineral rights would be acquired on 72,000 acres at an estimated cost of \$332,000, and finally mineral rights will be extinguished on about 2½ million acres in Alaska at a cost of \$50,000.

Mr. Speaker, the rescissions in this bill amount to \$1,300 million and if the bill is enacted into law some \$2,368,998,900 of Federal money will be spent.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most important bill; we are talking here today about vast sums of money, which, if authorized and appropriated, must be raised somehow. I am not in a position to say, Mr. Speaker, that we do not need these expenditures, and neither am I in a position to say we do need to make these expenditures. Therein lies the whole trouble, that we, the Members of the Congress, the representatives of the taxpayers, the people who must put up the money in the final analysis, are dependent upon our military authorities, upon our Armed Services, and Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, and we are incapable of going into these matters in detail, and determining whether they are justifiable or not. Frankly, I think this is one of the weaknesses of our system of operating in the Congress. I wish there were some way we could have a breakdown of these things and a justification for them without relying entirely upon the people who propose them and who say they are necessary.

In that connection—and I want to say this is no reflection upon the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] the very able chairman of this committee, or upon the individual members of that committee. As a matter of fact, I think they have done a splendid job in housekeeping, in spelling out, so that those who are sufficiently interested can look at their hearings, their reports and the bill and see just what is authorized. There should be some other machinery, not only in this type of legislation but in all legislation that is brought to this floor whereby some agency of the Congress, set up by the Congress and responsible to the Congress alone, could give us the justification for these tremendous expenditures; could give us both sides of the picture.

Such a bill has passed the Senate. Such a bill is pending in committee in

this House, a bill that would authorize a joint committee on the budget, made up of members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House and the Senate, with provision for an adequate staff, a staff that is responsible to that joint committee and to the separate Committees on Appropriation in the two Houses, and responsible to them alone. The Senate has passed such a bill in the last three Congresses, the McClellan bill. We have tried to pass a similar bill in the House, H. R. 34, a bill which I have the honor of sponsoring. We failed to consider that bill in a previous Congress by 16 votes, because of the opposition that was urged upon the floor of this House. The chief opposition that was made to that bill in the House was that there was some apprehension that if we passed that bill, then the other body would control the appropriations. Under the provisions of the House bill which I am sponsoring, the House is given additional proportionate representation on that committee. In fact, it is given 9 Members from the House compared with 7 from the other body.

Under the provisions of the House bill the chairmanship of that joint committee rests solely and permanently in the House and does not even alternate. Therefore, as one Member of the House, just a humble Member of the House, I am not willing to concede such inferiority complex; with 7 Members of the other body and 9 Members of this body and the chairmanship in this body that the other body would run away with the committee. Some people say they have such an apprehension. I cannot see it.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether this is the answer, but I do know that we need some independent agency that is responsible to the Congress and the Congress alone. What happens in these matters? And again I disclaim any idea of reflecting upon any agency, group, or any Member of Congress, but here is what happens. The so-called big brass—and I merely refer to them that way as a designation that is generally accepted—figure these things out; they send them to the President, and the President's Budget Bureau goes over them; then the President following the recommendation of his Budget Bureau sends them down to the Congress. Bear you in mind that the Pentagon, the so-called big brass, has millions and millions and millions of dollars, and hundreds and hundreds of experts, with their point of view, to justify their recommendations. Their requests come up here to the appropriate committee of the Congress, and that committee is largely at the mercy of the so-called big brass in the final analysis; and then when the matter gets on the floor we are all at the mercy of these experts that have been selected by the people who are interested—just as I am today.

I am going to vote for this bill, because in the dark I know not what else to do. But if this Congress were armed with a group of experts—and you can get them—who came in here and said to the Congress as employees of the Congress: "This item should be approved;" or "This

1955

7923

item should go out," I would feel a lot better about it.

I come back to my oft repeated theory: The Kremlin wants neither war nor peace; it wants to call all the signals. When Mr. Molotov smiles, the free world smiles; when Mr. Molotov frowns, we get scared. They call the signals; we run the defensive plays. They want neither war nor peace; but they want to require us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy, and we are doing a pretty good job. I again call your attention to Lenin's formula, "The way to defeat the United States is to make it spend itself into bankruptcy." We just got through a moment ago extending the debt limit, again increasing the borrowing power, again increasing the national debt that our grandchildren and great-grandchildren will be called upon to pay if this glorious Republic of ours lasts that long.

I have no pride of authorship in H. R. 34. I just want to call it again to the attention of the leadership of the House on both sides of the aisle, I want to call it to the attention of the Appropriations Committee, so vitally concerned. I hope that we can give further consideration to at least attempting through this method or some other method, if somebody will come up with a better one, to give this Congress the tools with which to work.

That House bill is nesting up there in the Committee on Rules, my committee. I have not made an attempt to have it reported because I have not found any evidence of a change of sentiment among those who defeated it on the previous occasion, but I give it to you at this time for your careful consideration, for your prayerful consideration, if you please, because if this Republic is to survive it is first going to have to have a stable economy and a stable fiscal policy.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I want to commend and congratulate the gentleman for the splendid remarks he has just made. Like him, I believe we should have experts protecting the interests of the Government when the justifiers come before the Appropriations Committee to testify. I think it is high time that all of the Members of this Congress realize that we have been fed the doctrine of fear, that we are being promoted into a bankrupt country by listening too much to the Communist propaganda.

The important thing the gentleman has said, in my judgment, is that we ought to have experts to bring light to the problems that confront us and we ought to realize that we are loading the coming generations with an insufferable debt they will have to pay if, as the gentleman wisely said, this glorious Republic is not thrown into bankruptcy by the executive departments of Government and largely by the Congress itself.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and reserve the balance of my time.

(Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has explained this rule thoroughly and also the bill it makes in order. Therefore, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 6829, with Mr. METCALF in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 96]

Adair	Gathings	Mack, Ill.
Alexander	Granahan	Malhiard
Allen, Calif.	Gray	Mason
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Meader
Becker	Gubser	Merrow
Bentley	Hagen	Miller, N. Y.
Billich	Hale	Mollohan
Boland	Halleck	Morgan
Boiton,	Harrison, Nebr.	Morrison
Oliver P.	Heseltone	Moulder
Bonner	Hinshaw	Mumma
Bosch	Hooven	Nelson
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Buckley	Holt	O'Konski
Byrne, Pa.	Holtzman	Polk
Canfield	Horan	Powell
Celler	Jackson	Prouty
Chatham	James	Quigley
Cole	Jensen	Reece, Tenn.
Coudert	Johnson, Wis.	Reed, N. Y.
Davidson	Jones, Mo.	Riehlman
Davis, Tenn.	Kean	Rivers
Denton	Kearney	Roosevelt
Diggs	Kearns	St. George
Dingell	Kee	Scherer
Dodd	King, Pa.	Sisk
Dollinger	Klein	Taylor
Donovan	Knox	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	Knutson	Thompson, La.
Doyle	Krueger	Thompson, Tex.
Eberhardt	Laird	Vank
Edmondson	Lesinski	Van Felt
Ellsworth	Lovre	Velde
Fino	McConnell	Vursell
Frelinghuysen	McGregor	Wigglesworth
Fulton	McIntire	Williams, N. J.
Gamble	Machrowicz	Withrow
Garmatz	Zelenko	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain con-

struction at military, naval, and Air Force installation, and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum he caused the roll to be called when 319 Members responded to their names, disclosing that a quorum was present, and he handed in the names of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], is recognized for 1 hour and 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] will be recognized for 1 hour and 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is what is termed a public works bill. It provides in this authorization \$551 million for the Army, \$596 million for the Navy, \$1,165,000,000 for the Air Force. That, along with titles IV and V, makes a total of \$2,368,998,900.

This bill was considered for 6 consecutive weeks by the Committee on Armed Services, sitting on an average of from 4 to 5 hours a day constantly.

There are over 400 named military installations in the bill, and in addition there are a great number of classified installations inside and outside the United States.

It is obvious from this that the presentation of details with respect to the bill could go on here on the floor of the House for a long time; but in this magnificent report that we have filed we think you will find material to aid you in seeing what the committee had in mind and the scope of their inquiries.

Now, let us take up the Army. In the Army title, 30 percent of the program of \$160 million is for antiaircraft facilities. This includes what is known as Nike sites. They, as you know, are established all over the United States in various places, and in the hearings a great many are identified and a great many are being built all the time.

Some 12 percent, or \$64 million is for troop housing and troop support facilities; 17 percent, or \$88 million, is for family housing, and this presents 5,765 badly needed family quarters.

Thirty-eight million dollars, or 7 percent of the program, is for land acquisition. In this connection I wish to draw your attention to page 22 of the report, which sets out the land proposed for acquisition by all of the military departments. In the case of the Army, most of the money and about 50 percent of the acreage is in Okinawa. Most of the land required in the United States will be for 2 installations: The expansion of Fort Sill, Okla., which will involve some 20,000 acres of privately owned land, and the West Coast Ammunition Terminal, in California, which will involve some 22,000 acres. NIKE installations will require some 2,500 acres.

June 27

Four percent of the program, or \$26 million, is for further permanent construction in Alaska and Okinawa—2 of our most important strategic areas today.

This is a total of \$372 million, or 70 percent of the Army portion of the bill.

The remaining 30 percent will provide for additional construction in Iceland, construction for research and development, here in this country.

Now, on page 3 the Army's program is broken out in detailed categories. It indicates whether the construction is in the United States or overseas. Underneath that table you will note that each of the technical services and each of the continental armies is dealt with individually by the type of facility to be constructed and the portion of the program it represents. This description continues on page 4, where the Military Academy, the special weapons project, and some of the other items are described, as are the overseas areas.

Section 102 of the bill contains an authorization of \$224 million for classified military construction, and section 103 is an authority granted in most of the public works bills to cover emergency construction, that is, where facilities are destroyed by fire, hurricane, or other catastrophes.

The remainder of the Army title, that is sections 104 and 105, merely authorizes the transfer of authorizations previously granted at Fort Knox, Ky., and Woodbridge, Va.

Now let us turn to the Navy.

The Navy title, which totals \$596 million, is another increment in the program to keep the Navy's shore establishment up to the ships, aircraft, and weapons which it must service.

The Navy would get authority under this program to construct almost 3,100 units of family housing; bachelor officers' quarters for 5,600 officers; and about 11,000 barracks spaces for enlisted personnel.

One of the important new elements in the Navy's program is a large-scale acquisition of property for 40 of the naval air stations throughout the United States. Nineteen of these are used for carrier landing practice, and appropriate easements will be purchased from the surrounding landowners to permit pilots to develop the kind of technique that is necessary for landing on carriers—and to do this in a safe manner.

The effect on the surrounding landowners is not as great as might be expected, since in virtually every case farming and other normal activities can be carried on as before. The major requirement at these bases is that there be no structures or trees above 50 feet.

Here is the reason we are forced to do this: These pilots who will learn to land on an airplane carrier must first be trained to land on what is called a ground pattern. A ground pattern must be such that they can go around this field, and there will be no obstructions on either side and land as they do on an airplane carrier. It will be necessary to purchase and acquire by easement the rights of removal of any objects higher than 50 feet off the ground.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman say where this land is being acquired?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, yes. It is being acquired at these 19 stations that are already established. All we are doing is getting the easement rights to fly closer to the ground as we circle these 19 bases so that these pilots will learn how to land on a carrier deck.

Mr. GROSS. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia that we have an inactivated station at Ottumwa, Iowa, where there is a considerable amount of land already.

Mr. VINSON. We are not building a single new station in this part of the program. We are merely clearing out the timber or trees that interfere with this type of training.

Mr. GROSS. You already have that at Ottumwa.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to my very able friend, I do not see why they have not utilized that magnificent field out there. I am satisfied that with his persistent efforts and the cooperation of the Armed Services Committee it will probably be put in use.

This is a program which the committee viewed with great favor as one which will not only provide proper and safe training, but will prevent the expenditure of great sums of money in the future.

At the bottom of page 5 of the report you will note a table which breaks down by category the Navy's program. The table sets out everyday operational facilities totaling 58 percent, or \$345 million; troop housing about 12 percent, or \$71 million; and family housing about 9 percent, or \$56 million. Research and development, training facilities, the aviation-easement program that I just mentioned, are also indicated in the table, along with a small amount for morale, welfare, and recreational facilities, pollution-abatement programs, and land acquisition.

The Navy's land acquisition, both fee and easements, is spread over a large number of installations. The only substantial acquisitions at particular areas are those involving the training bases at New Iberia, La.; Port Isabel, Tex.; and the air facility for the Naval Academy.

Following the table, on pages 6 and 7, the whole Navy program is broken down into 11 classes. Shipyard facilities would total \$51½ million, fleet base facilities \$44½ million, aviation facilities \$314 million, and you will note that this last category is again broken down into 5 different kinds of air stations, each of which is described in detail.

Page 7 sets out the amounts authorized for supply facilities, \$9,254,000; Marine Corps facilities, \$61.6 million; ordnance facilities, \$21 million; and service school facilities for \$30 million. The only two other relatively large amounts are \$26 million for communications facilities and \$34 million for yards and docks.

AIR FORCE

The Air Force again this year would get an authorization about equal to the other two services combined. This con-

struction would be spread over 255 principal bases; 151 of which are in the United States and 104 overseas.

All of this program for the Air Force is, of course, aimed at 137 wings.

When the 137-wing Air Force is attained, in 1957, there will be 346 principal installations. One hundred and eighty-six of these will be in the United States, and 160 overseas. These, of course, do not include some 2,000 minor installations, such as communication sites, radar stations, and so forth.

On pages 9 to 13, the Air Force program is broken down in detail by the various commands. As would be expected, the Strategic Air Command gets the largest share of the authorization, with about \$224½ million in the United States. The aircraft control and warning system gets \$100 million in the United States and almost the same amount overseas. I do not need to emphasize the importance of this part of the program.

The Air Defense Command is next in amount of authorization, with the other commands getting varying amounts according to the status of their programs today.

The land acquisition program of the Air Force is quite small compared with the other two services, with a total of less than 17,000 acres to be acquired in fee and 23,000 in easements.

The only two large acquisitions are those for the Buckingham Weapons Center, in Florida, and the air defense base in the Milwaukee, Wis., area. These acquisitions are respectively 6,000 acres, of which 4,000 will be donated to the Government, and 4,000 in the case of the Milwaukee base.

As I mentioned before, in the case of all of the three services an effort has been made in the report to break down the program in several different ways, in order that whatever the particular interest of the Member may be he can find the information he wants easily and without undue study.

You can find what each of the commands is getting in authorization, while on page 13 of the report the table there shows the program broken down by categories. For example, airfield pavements is the largest part of the program, with operational facilities next, family housing, and so on down the line.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw your attention, and the attention of the Committee, to the new installations in the program. These are always of particular interest, and they appear on page 15 of the report.

The Army had only one, the West Coast Ammunition Terminal in California. The Navy has three, all of them air facilities. The first one is at Port Isabel, Tex.; the second at New Iberia, La.; and the third, which was inserted by the committee, is an air facility for the Naval Academy.

The Air Force has two new installations: Buckingham Weapons Center, Fort Myers, Fla., which will be the East Coast facility for training our fighter pilots in gunnery—the West Coast one being at Yuma, Ariz. The other new Air Force base is also an Air Defense

Command installation and it will be in the greater Milwaukee area, Wis.

Although the Department of Defense submitted a good program, the committee added certain items which are set out on page 15. No new item was added for the Air Force, but a hospital at Camp Jackson, S. C., was added for the Army, and the Naval Air Facility at the Naval Academy was added for the Navy. This is the same facility I just mentioned.

This air facility was recommended by the Board of Visitors at the Naval Academy, as were the other two items at Annapolis—an addition to Bancroft Hall and some of the fill necessary to provide additional land area.

Another important construction item added by the committee appears in title IV of the bill. This would authorize the construction or rehabilitation of five units of housing, a communications facility and other related items for the chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff and four of his assistants. At the present time all of the Chiefs of Staff are provided with adequate housing. For example, the Commandant of the Marine Corps has some 15,000 square feet in his house, while Admiral Radford's house is something a little over 3,000 square feet.

These buildings are to be erected on land adjacent to the Naval Observatory.

Now in addition to that, it is recommended here that \$56 million be made available to the Central Intelligence Agency to establish a permanent building to house its activities. There are a great number of people employed by the Central Intelligence Agency here in the District of Columbia, and they are being housed in some 33 or more buildings. Mr. Dulles, the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, feels that being housed in many units, as they are, jeopardizes the security that is required. Now, you know what the Central Intelligence Agency is. So, we provide here an authorization of \$56 million for land and a building.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are these buildings for the Central Intelligence Agency, estimated to cost \$50 million, to be constructed within 30 or 35 miles of the District of Columbia? Can the gentleman tell me?

Mr. VINSON. During the hearings Mr. Dulles designated certain places. Some were outside the District of Columbia. But, he did feel that it was absolutely essential, in view of the character of the work he does, to be within reasonable distance of the District of Columbia. I would say 35 to 40 miles from the District or probably more, but that was the line of testimony.

There were about 125 amendments to the original bill, which totaled at the time it was submitted, about \$2,354,000,-000. The bill that you have before you totals almost \$2,369,000,000. This is an increase of about \$14½ million. In the process of its consideration, the committee eliminated items in the amount of over \$33 million and added items in the amount of about \$48 million.

You will note at the bottom of page 15 and on page 16 of the report that the committee gave special consideration to several of the controversial items which naturally arise in every public-works bill. One of these is the land acquisition in Okinawa, another was the expansion of Fort Sill; two of the Navy proposals involving New Iberia and Port Chicago were also in the same category.

A number of the members of the Maryland and Ohio delegations were heard with respect to the proposed move of the headquarters of the Research and Development Command from Baltimore to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

A matter of particular interest, as evidenced by the mail which the committee has received, relates to the effect of the Government's construction of family housing on Wherry projects.

I want to draw your attention to the table set out on page 21 of the report, which contains every installation at which there is a Wherry project and at which housing would be constructed under this bill. If you will look at the last column you will see that in every instance, even after taking into consideration every conceivable kind of housing, there still is a large deficit at those installations.

Of course, the second last column indicates only about 4,500 housing units to be constructed at these bases. The whole bill contains about 17,000 units, but these other houses are to be constructed at bases where there is no Wherry housing.

Last year Congress authorized 11,600 family housing units. This bill, as I say, will authorize about 17,000 units. They will vary in cost, with the overall average in the United States being \$13,480. Of these 17,000 houses, 3,500 represent replacements of quarters that can no longer be lived in. Five thousand two hundred and seventy-one are for officers, and 11,700 are for enlisted men.

All of this housing will be of permanent construction and located for the most part at permanent installations.

Section 609 of the bill, appearing on page 70, would permit a military department to acquire, upon the application of the project owner, any Wherry housing project at an installation at which housing would be constructed directly by the Government under this bill. I want to draw your particular attention to the fact that the project owner has to want to get rid of his project and make application that it be purchased by a military department before this can be done.

To my mind a project owner would probably want to have the department acquire his project only if it has proved to be an unprofitable business venture. In any event, I want to stress that it is entirely a voluntary act on the part of the private owner.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a good bill and that it represents a sound program. It was unanimously reported by the House Armed Services Committee.

I respectfully urge its passage.

Mr. Chairman, to show you how carefully we considered this bill, I should like

to say this. I am proud of what the committee did with this bill. We worked 6 long weeks and read every item, line by line, in order to approve this proposed authorization of \$2,369,000,000. It takes a long time to find out how to spend that much money, and we took the time.

We amended the bill in 125 different places and reduced the authorization requested. But when we added these authorizations in Maryland and South Carolina, it increased the total. As I say, there were about 125 amendments to the original bill, the total of which when it was submitted was \$2,354,000,-000. The bill before you now calls for a total of \$2,369,000,000, an increase of about \$14,500,000.

In the process of its consideration, the committee eliminated items in the amount of \$33 million and added items in the amount of \$48 million.

Had it not been for the fact that we felt the circumstances warranted it, such as the hospital at Camp Jackson and the activities at the Naval Academy, as a result of our screening and careful scrutiny of the bill, which we passed on in a line by line consideration, there would have been a reduction of \$33 million.

I want to say this further. This is a department measure. It is recommended by the Director of the Budget. It is recommended by Mr. Floete's office, which was created for the purpose of scrutinizing and coordinating these public works.

I ask that the bill be enacted because the facts and circumstances warrant it. It is absolutely essential to carry on this public works construction to keep our military forces in the shape in which they should be kept.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I notice on page 17 of the report mention is made of a suggestion of moving the Fifth Army headquarters from Chicago to Des Moines. Would the gentleman explain that?

Mr. VINSON. A great many suggestions come before the Committee on Armed Services. Oftentimes it seems they are sowed in fertile soil and bear fruit. Sometimes they fall among thorns and thistles. I am afraid that suggestion has fallen among thorns and thistles. I do not think the gentleman need disturb himself about it, because Secretary Stevens said that he was going to examine it, he did examine it, and concluded that the facts at this time did not warrant that proposal.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman will recall that some weeks ago I telephoned him when there was such a report in Chicago, and asked him about it.

Mr. VINSON. I want to compliment the gentleman who represents the city of Chicago for being so alert. I have always known that he was right here on the job and his inquiry substantiates my conclusion.

June 27

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if there are no further questions, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee, in his usual forceful and comprehensive fashion, has covered every major element of the bill and there is little that I can add to his statement.

I would like to join him, however, in directing the attention of every Member of the House to the report on the bill, for in it, as Chairman VINSON has said, one can find about every important aspect of the bill dealt with in detail sufficient for a quick understanding of the program.

The Air Force portion of the bill is just about equal to the Army and Navy portions combined. This is understandable since it is a new service and one which is in the process of building up. The other services have had their bases of operation and their physical facilities for many years.

I would like, therefore, to devote a little time to a discussion of the Air Force portion of the bill, and specifically to the Air Defense Command mission of the Air Force.

During the past 4 years the Communists have built up a military strength without parallel in history. They have created a whole new air force in Red China and have made it the fourth most powerful in the world. They have made achievements in nuclear development almost equal to our own. They have paraded numbers of new medium jet bombers and a new long-range jet bomber comparable to the best in our Air Force. They have kept the world's largest standing army at peak strength, and never relaxed their vigilance in the training of their units.

In Korea they showed us that their pilots could fight, and that they had a first-rate plane to fight with. There is evidence that they are putting vast resources into guided missile production and into the development of an intercontinental ballistic missile with sufficient range to destroy targets in the United States. In countless ways they have indicated that they are preparing for war, and are not adverse to engaging in it. They constantly create irritants on the international political scene that try our patience, and test our forbearance. They show no will to live at peace with the world, but consistently follow a philosophy that recognizes war as a natural state.

In a world now divided between those nations who support us in our efforts for peace, and those nations that look to the Soviets for guidance in national as well as international policy, we have no alternative but to prepare against aggression they may commit against us. We know what happened in 1917, what happened in 1941, and we know how peace was violated in 1950. We know also that at none of these times were we truly prepared for the war we were compelled to wage.

From our knowledge of the past, however, we have learned a lesson we must henceforth remember. That lesson is that the best way to avoid war is to have available those forces and weapons which will insure complete and final defeat of any aggressor who attacks us. By our own preparedness we can make aggression an enterprise of disaster for any potential enemy. The Air Force program for the defense of the United States is based solidly on that premise.

The missions of the Air Force commands, established by Act of Congress, are well known. The mission of the Air Defense Command is to provide Air Forces for the air defense of the United States and to coordinate all operations pertaining thereto. Such operations are conducted by the Continental Air Defense Command, a joint command, including elements of the Army, Navy, and Air Force under single control; by the Alaskan Air Command and the Northeast Air Command in the Western Hemisphere, and by such theater commands as the Far East Air Forces and the United States Air Forces in Europe.

It is not surprising that in appropriations for military construction, the largest amount called for, next to the request for the Strategic Air Command, are for the Air Defense Command and its related activities, the Aircraft Control and Warning System, in the United States, in Canada, and elsewhere.

The share for the Air Defense Command of the continental United States program amounts to almost 17 percent. The money appropriated will permit initiation of construction on two new bases—one in Florida and one in Wisconsin—and provide a second increment at the six new interceptor bases initially authorized last year.

In addition to base construction, these funds will permit the construction of rocket assembly and storage buildings for strange new types of weapons that are rapidly becoming familiar in the modern arsenal—rockets and guided missiles. These weapons must be stored on the flight line in order to be available when needed. In addition, we must have storage with certain temperature and humidity controls and special facilities for processing missiles from dead to live storage. The development of new weapons is an expensive thing. The providing of facilities for their employment is also expensive. But the national security does not permit us to cavil at the expense. America must be defended.

As with the Strategic Air Command, facilities for personnel are important to the success of the mission of the command. Buildings for the readiness crews are as important to the success of the Air Defense Command's mission as are the planes the crews must fly. Time required to place an interceptor mission in the air must be held to a minimum. Crews on ready status must remain in the immediate vicinity of their aircraft for extended periods of time. The buildings provided for them must have a diet kitchen, and sleeping quarters, and recreational quarters of a modest sort. These buildings are their homes, for a good part of their service lives.

Family housing must also be provided. In an emergency, immediate and maximum readiness is jeopardized by crews having to travel long distances from home to duty posts. The family housing which the Air Defense Command seeks funds to build is essential, not only from the personnel or welfare point of view, but also because it will allow crews to be close to their planes and stations, even when they are not on duty in the readiness buildings. The modern airman must live close to his plane.

Part of the authority requested is for construction of taxiways and airfield pavements necessary to increase the operational effectiveness of each base. Part is for airfield lighting, to provide the necessary illumination to accommodate sustained bad weather and night operations at each fighter interceptor base. Part is for additional maintenance facilities. All funds are requested to permit the Air Force to take full advantage of the latest developments in all the fields of research, and, as quickly as new methods or procedures are perfected, to integrate them into the overall defense system.

But the first step in the air defense of the United States is to provide the combat elements with sufficient warning of an impending attack to enable them to intercept and destroy hostile forces before such forces reach the line for their bomb release. To accomplish this, a series of radar warning systems are either in being or under construction. The most northern of those scheduled is commonly referred to as the DEW line—or "Distant early warning line"—which runs across the Arctic. There is also the Mid-Canada System, operated to a large extent by the Dominion of Canada. Within the United States proper, an extensive radar system is being constructed. Two other radar systems operated by the Air Force further extend the zone of coverage and provide additional protection. The first of these is an airborne operation hundreds of miles off our ocean coastlines; the second consists of fixed radar stations on "Texas towers" being constructed on shoals approximately 75 miles off the eastern coast of the United States. But all these systems, though separate in nature, are coordinated by the Continental Air Defense Command and are part of Air Defense Command operations.

So in the request for funds for military construction for this command there are two sizable items—\$100 million for aircraft control and warning system in the continental United States and \$98 million for continental defense located outside the continental United States.

With this money the Air Force can complete facilities at 31 permanent sites. It will be able to place equipment on 74 unattended sites in the United States and additional ones in Canada. It will be able to build a fifth "Texas tower" to provide seaward extension of contiguous coverage off the northeast Atlantic Coast, and it will be able to do necessary construction work on the DEW line to insure implementation of this line to meet the established operational date.

1955

7927

The ramparts we watch are no longer within our sight, but they must be watched with a vigilance that keeps them under our control and out of the hands of the enemy. The Air Defense Command defends our homes by not permitting the enemy to make our cities and our homes the targets for their bomb drops. There are no more important items in the military-construction program than the items for construction of the required facilities of the Air Defense Command. America must be defended, but the defense, if it is not also to involve destruction of our cities, must be kept as remote as possible from the boundaries of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield gladly.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows of my continuing interest in the Grandview Airport near Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. I see there is an appropriation here for the Grandview Airbase. Can the gentleman tell me whether the Continental Air Command has ever been moved to that base?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. It has not been moved.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman will insist that it be done since that was the basis of arguments in favor of spending millions for the construction of this base.

Mr. VINSON. I doubt very seriously if it will be done this session or next session.

Mr. GROSS. Or the next session?

Mr. VINSON. But with the learned gentleman's constant observation and persistence I am satisfied something will be accomplished. Anticipating that the gentleman was going to inquire about Grandview I have had a little brief prepared on Grandview, and I will be glad to read it or to insert it in the Record.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's personal comment but I am also interested in the spending of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. VINSON. I knew the gentleman was going to bring up Grandview so I had this statement prepared.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may be allowed to insert his statement at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

GRANDVIEW AIR FORCE BASE, Mo.

As you know, Grandview Municipal Airport, Kansas City, Mo., was selected because of its central location in the United States for the headquarters of the Central Air Defense Force, and because of the necessity of establishing a base for fighter-interceptor squadrons for protection of the huge Wichita-Kansas industrial area. In addition, the Air Force proposed to move the headquarters of the Continental Air Command from Mitchel Air Force Base, N. Y., to Grandview. On January 1, 1952, Grandview Municipal Airport was leased by the Air Force for a period of 25 years for the sum of \$1. The donation in fee of the Grandview Air

Terminal to the United States Government was authorized by the city of Kansas City at the November 1952 election.

Headquarters, Continental Air Command, was never moved to Grandview because of a decision by the Air Force that Mitchel Air Force Base was not economically expandible for conversion to a modern tactical air base. Consequently, to obtain maximum utilization of our large pre-World War II investment at Mitchel, it has been retained as an administrative base and utilized by the Continental Air Command.

At the present time, Grandview Air Force Base is the headquarters of the Central Air Defense Force. This defense force is responsible for the air defense of that portion of the United States located between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains. In addition, a fighter-interceptor wing, large communications center, Air Reserve activity and a segment of the A. C. and W. Radar Network are located on Grandview Air Force Base.

The total amount of construction authorized for this installation through fiscal year 1955 is \$19.3 million. Total amount of funds applied to this authorization through fiscal year 1955 is \$15.6 million.

The fiscal year 1956 military construction program contains line items in the amount of \$3,402,000 for future construction.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX] may insert his own remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I do not speak in opposition to H. R. 6829, which carries authorization for \$12,148,000 for the proposed jet base set forth in the bill as Traverse City area. I do favor the selection by the Air Base Command of a site in northern Michigan. The selection of this site has become a very controversial issue, as many of the Members of Congress are aware that the first site selected by the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Talbott, was in Grand Traverse County.

There were objections raised by the Interlochen Music Camp, operated jointly by the University of Michigan and the State of Michigan, under the directorship of Dr. Maddy. The second site was selected in Benzie County, which was objected to by the Committee on Armed Services because of interference with the Interlochen Music Camp. There were several other sites offered by communities for the construction of the proposed jet base.

Secretary Talbott then selected Cadillac as the location of the base. I believe it to be a well-known fact that considerable opposition generated throughout the Congress and in the communities because of this selection.

The Committee on Appropriations then directed Secretary Talbott to submit justifications for the selection of the Cadillac site which resulted in a resurvey of the Cadillac site, and a site known as Kalkaska site, 14 miles from downtown Traverse City, and any other sites that the Secretary believed to be desira-

ble for the construction of the base. The results of the resurvey were made known to the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee and a copy of the communication was submitted to the Committee on Armed Services. The communication from Secretary Talbott to the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee stated that he had eliminated the proposed Benzle site, known as the Homestead site, because of its nearness to the Interlochen Music Camp, and further stated "the remaining two sites are both satisfactory in operational aspects." Talbott reported that although the initial construction cost at Kalkaska site is estimated at about 9 percent less than Cadillac, he felt that the location of Cadillac City, only a few miles from the base site, provided readily available community support that would outweigh this differential in original cost, basing his opinion on the fact that the city of Cadillac can take care of additional Air Force dependents with existing schools and recreational facilities. Talbott further stated "This is not the case at Kalkaska."

I believe the Secretary was well aware that there never was any intent that the village of Kalkaska was able to absorb any great influx of children in their public schools, but he has not given credit to the availability of the fine schools, churches, and recreational facilities offered at Traverse City. The Secretary stated that it is approximately 18 miles from the Kalkaska site to Traverse City. This, of course, is excessive, and the actual mileage would be 14 miles.

Now, I call to the attention of the Congress, using the Secretary's own words in this statement to the congressional committees, that he admits that the Kalkaska site and Cadillac site are both satisfactory in operational aspects. The Secretary further points out, and he has served notice on the Congress that the site he has selected at Cadillac will cost 9 percent more to build than at Kalkaska.

Now let us take a look and see just how much money is involved in this 9 percent which is the Secretary's own percentage figure. With the approval of the bill now pending before the House, the amount of money involved would be \$12,148,000, so at 9 percent of this figure the Congress could save the Government \$1,093,320, by constructing the base at the Kalkaska site. I do not believe that the Congress is ready to appropriate \$1,093,320 more to construct the base in one locality than it would cost in another locality as long as the Secretary is in complete agreement that the base at the lower figure is satisfactory for operations.

We are cognizant of the fact that the Air Force has a base at Kinross, Mich., which is 18 miles south of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; Sault Ste. Marie being the supporting town for educational, religious, and recreational facilities. Last summer, Maj. Gen. Joe W. Kelly requested that I contact the people and the organizations of the Sault Ste. Marie area to determine their willingness to cooperate. This I did and met with 100

percent approval for establishing a permanent base at Kinross along with the expansion program. If there is justification for the Air Force to expand an airbase 18 miles from the supporting city, then I can see no justification for the Air Force to object to constructing a base 14 miles from the supporting city, which in this case would be Traverse City supporting the Kalkaska site with a direct saving of \$1,093,320 to the Government.

In conclusion I repeat that the Air Force Secretary, Mr. Talbott, has served due and sufficient notice upon the Congress that the site at Kalkaska is satisfactory and comparable to Cadillac as far as operations are concerned, and further serves notice upon the Congress that the project will cost \$1,093,320 more to build at Cadillac than it would at Kalkaska.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am serving notice on the Congress that I am opposed to the reckless spending of public funds when such spending in my opinion cannot be justified or produce greater accomplishments in behalf of the Air Force, but merely to satisfy the Secretary of the Air Force who has produced no sane justification to make such a request of the Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to take this opportunity to thank the members of the committee, the chairman of the committee, and the ranking minority member for the very kind and sympathetic consideration they gave to problems which came up in this bill which affect the people of the district in California which I represent.

There was one proposal which came before the committee, which, had it been approved by the committee, would have surrounded and isolated a town of 3,000 people, the town of Port Chicago, Calif. The committee was kind enough to give consideration to many resolutions of the county organizations and to the people of the town involved and to strike the particular proposal from the record. Let me say I think it was a very considerate position that the committee took to recognize the problems of local communities such as Port Chicago.

There is another proposal in the bill, in county, also in my district, the West Coast Ammunition Terminal. It is my understanding after talking with the chairman and the ranking minority member that, although this proposal is included in this bill, before final action is taken to acquire the property involved for the West Coast Ammunition Terminal, a subcommittee of this committee will be going to California this fall and the subcommittee will inspect this property proposed to be acquired by the West Coast Ammunition Terminal, the Real Estate Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. I think that is the situation, and I ask the chairman if I have made an accurate statement of my understanding.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman from California has made an accurate statement. I may say that in the matter of acquisition of land, as no doubt the

Members well know, while it may be authorized in this bill, and money may be appropriated, yet before the Government purchases the land it must again be scrutinized by the Armed Services Committee of the House and the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. So when the subcommittee goes out to look at the situation in regard both to Port Chicago and the West Coast Ammunition Terminal they will take those two subject matters into consideration and advise the committee, before 1 foot of land is acquired.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman for that statement and that understanding.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time to make an observation regarding the family housing situation at some of our military installations in England and in the European theater. I realize that the members of this committee have gone into the situation very thoroughly, but, having been a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling military construction features, we visited some of these installations last year.

The housing situation at these bases, for instance Dreux and Evreux in France, were deplorable. While I realize we have a guaranteed housing program in that theater, especially in France, my observation was that it is not working. It seems impossible to get guarantees for housing in any areas except such as Paris or some of the large metropolitan areas. When we go into some of these smaller communities where we have these bases nearby we find, as far as our airmen are concerned, it is impossible for them to bring their families there and give them the kind of housing they are entitled to.

As I said before, I realize this is a problem that has complexities, not the least of which are agreements between the foreign countries in which they are located and ourselves, but it seems to me that we ought to give serious consideration to the building of these family units on the airbase at a given location. It seems to me impossible for these people to live under the conditions that we expect them to.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, has the committee given any consideration to the locating of family housing at some of these out-of-the-way airbases, for instance, on the particular base itself?

Mr. VINSON. I may say to the distinguished gentleman that that has been a subject matter that is constantly before the committee. We are constantly giving close scrutiny to it. As a matter of fact, subcommittees have been over there at least once or twice during the recess trying to ascertain what is the proper thing to do. You must recognize the fact that in dealing with that question there is, for instance, one phase of the Commodity Credit Corporation involved and another phase the rental guaranty program. The gentleman may rest assured that the committee is conscious of it and is giving the matter all the consideration we possibly can.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am reminded of a question that might be asked at this time of the chairman of the committee. I overheard the gentleman from Missouri mention that included in this bill is additional authorization for instruments on the six new fighter interceptor bases that were authorized originally last year. Of course, included in the original six is a very controversial one in the State of the gentleman now addressing the House. I wonder whether the committee did not have some hesitancy about granting additional authorization to the Michigan base where this controversy is very warm at the present time with reference to whether or not a site has been agreed upon where these additional authorized structures are to be placed.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman that as far as the Armed Services Committee is concerned, we have been advised that the Secretary is definitely reaffirming his views in selecting Cadillac as an area referred to in connection with the Traverse City area. I have my personal views, but nevertheless those are the facts of the case.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The chairman then has more faith in the repeated confirmation of this site than he had in the repeated confirmation of the sites that were given last year.

Mr. VINSON. All I can say is that the Secretary advised the committee in writing that he had reaffirmed after further examination his previous choice, and reached the conclusion that Cadillac was the place where he was going to place it. Of course, if I had been making the selection, somebody might not agree with it, but that is how it stands.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It was on that basis, then, that the further authorization for this site was included in this bill?

Mr. VINSON. That is with reference to the Traverse City area arrangement. They laid it out in broad language, and then the Department goes before the Committee on Appropriations and says that he has selected Cadillac as the place. We do not pinpoint it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will reluctantly vote for this bill which calls for the appropriation of nearly \$2½ billion.

I have the feeling that there is altogether too much fat in this military construction bill but it is wellnigh impossible for a Member of Congress who is not a member of the Armed Services Committee, to know where reductions can properly be made.

I cannot understand why, for instance, funds should be authorized for the building of a new Navy aviation training facility in Texas when the permanently constructed facility for this purpose stands unused near Ottumwa, Iowa.

Since becoming a Member of Congress, I have voted for practically all appropriations that have been requested for the building of this Nation's defenses,

1955

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

but I want it understood now that these costs have got to decrease in terms of new installations. If there is the proper construction and housekeeping, these bills can be drastically reduced and that is exactly what must occur if this Nation is to remain solvent.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to establish or develop military installations and facilities by the acquisition, construction, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works in respect of the following projects, which include site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Technical services facilities
(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.: Troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and family housing, \$1,736,000.

Black Hills Ordnance Depot, S. Dak.: Family housing, \$78,000.

Blue Grass Ordnance Depot, Ky.: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$509,000.

Erie Ordnance Depot, Ohio: Operational and maintenance facilities and utilities, \$1,933,000.

Frankford Arsenal, Pa.: Utilities, \$855,000.

Lordstown Ordnance Depot, Ohio: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$875,000.

Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colo.: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$1,843,000.

Red River Arsenal, Tex.: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$140,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Ala.: Research and development facilities and community facilities, \$2,865,000.

Rock Island Arsenal, Ill.: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$347,000.

Rossford Ordnance Depot, Ohio: Utilities, \$400,000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Ill.: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$342,000.

Seneca Ordnance Depot, N. Y.: Community facilities, \$129,000.

Sierra Ordnance Depot, Calif.: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$1,075,000.

White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex.: Troop supporting facility, and research and development facilities, \$1,247,000.

Wingate Ordnance Depot, N. Mex.: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$632,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Atlanta General Depot, Ga.: Storage facilities, \$84,000.

Belle Meade General Depot, N. J.: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$174,000.

Fort Lee, Va.: Troop housing, community facilities, medical facility, storage facilities, training facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, \$8,589,000.

Memphis General Depot, Tenn.: Family housing, \$99,000.

New Cumberland General Dcpot, Pa.: Family housing, \$568,000.

Sharpe General Depot, Calif.: Utilities and family housing, \$337,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Army Chemical Center, Md.: Troop housing, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$1,248,000.

Deseret Chemical Depot, Utah: Maintenance facilities, \$92,000.

Camp Detrick, Md.: Utilities, \$452,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Troop housing, hospital and medical facilities, operational and maintenance facilities and family housing, \$1,129,000.

Pine Bluff Arsenal (including Midwest Chemical Depot), Ark.: Land acquisition, \$3,000.

Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Colo.: Operational and maintenance facilities and utilities, \$773,000.

(Signal Corps)

Decatur Signal Depot, Ill.: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$303,000.

Fort Huachuca, Ariz.: Airfield pavements, community facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, utilities, and family housing, \$4,648,000.

Lexington Signal Depot, Ky.: Maintenance facility, and family housing, \$538,000.

Fort Monmouth, N. J.: Community facilities, \$615,000.

Sacramento Signal Depot, Calif.: Troop housing, maintenance facility, and family housing, \$715,000.

Tobiahanna Signal Depot, Pa.: Troop housing, \$649,000.

Two Rock Ranch Station, Calif.: Community facilities, and family housing, \$1,298,000.

Vint Hill Farms Station, Va.: Community facilities, storage facility, and operational and maintenance facility, \$695,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Army Map Service, Md.: Operational and maintenance facility, \$62,000.

Fort Belvoir, Va.: Troop housing, community facilities, research and development facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, utilities, and family housing, \$4,608,000.

Grante City Engineer Depot, Ill.: Operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, \$1,822,000.

Marion Engineer Depot, Ohio: Storage facilities and utilities, \$1,146,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Brooklyn Army Base, N. Y.: Utilities, \$1,055,000.

Charleston Transportation Depot, S. C.: Storage facilities and utilities, \$329,000.

Fort Tustis, Va.: Troop housing, community facilities, training facilities, medical facility, and operational and maintenance facilities, \$6,597,000.

New Orleans Army Base, La.: Storage facility, \$117,000.

Oakland Army Base, Calif.: Community facilities, storage facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, \$1,923,000.

Fort Story, Va.: Utilities, \$41,000.

West Coast Ammunition Terminal, Calif.: Dredging and land acquisition, \$12,860,000.

(Medical Corps)

William Beaumont Army Hospital, Tex.: Hospital and medical facilities, \$586,000.

Brooke Army Medical Center, Tex.: Hospital and medical facilities, \$549,000.

Madigan Army Hospital, Wash.: Hospital and medical facilities, \$333,000.

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, D. C.: Hospital facilities, research and development facilities, and training facilities, \$7,632,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Mass.: Troop housing, administrative facilities, and family housing, \$7,275,000.

Fort Dix, N. J.: Community facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, and family housing, \$6,698,000.

Fort Jay, N. Y.: Waterfront facilities, \$731,000.

Fort Niagara, N. Y.: Storage facilities, \$209,000.

Fort Totten, N. Y.: Utilities, \$170,000.

(Second Army Area)

Fort Holabird, Md.: Troop housing, \$612,000.

Fort Knox, Ky.: Troop housing, training and administrative facilities, community facilities, medical facilities, operational and

maintenance facilities, and family housing, \$8,990,000.

Fort George G. Meade, Md.: Community facilities, training and medical facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, \$923,-00.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Ga.: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, \$10,392,000.

Fort Bragg, N. C.: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, airfield pavements, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, \$15,659,000.

Fort Campbell, Ky.: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, \$12,377,000.

Camp Gordon, Ga.: Community facilities, \$261,000.

Camp Jackson, S. C.: Medical facilities, \$8 million.

Fort McClellan, Ala.: Community facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, \$2,-611,000.

Camp Rucker, Ala.: Airfield pavements, and operational and maintenance facilities, \$2,070,000.

Camp Stewart, Ga.: Troop housing, storage facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, \$967,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Tex.: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, \$4,645,000.

Fort Hood, Tex.: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, \$12,922,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Tex.: Troop housing and operational facilities, \$805,000.

Fort Sill, Okla.: Community facilities, medical facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, \$3,-053,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Carson, Colo.: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, airfield pavements, storage facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, \$7,487,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kans.: Hospital and medical facilities, training facilities, and operational facilities, \$8,615,000.

Camp Lucas, Mich.: Community facilities, \$145,000.

Fort Riley, Kans.: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, \$8,657,000.

Fort Sheridan, Ill.: Family housing, \$1,288,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Camp Hanford, Wash.: Waterfront facilities, \$167,000.

Fort Lewis, Wash.: Troop housing community facilities, training facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, \$15,275,000.

Presidio of Monterey, Calif.: Troop housing and training facilities, \$1,878,000.

Fort Ord, Calif.: Community facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, \$1,407,000.

Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.: Liquid fuel dispensing facilities, \$144,000.

United States Disciplinary Barracks, Calif.: Community facilities, \$184,000.

Yuma Test Station, Ariz.: Family housing, \$709,000.

June 27

(Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, N. Y.: Community facilities and utilities, \$756,000.

(Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)

Sandia Base, N. Mex.: Family housing, \$1,231,000.

Various installations: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$3,014,000.

(Tactical Installations)

Various locations: Family housing, \$8,135,-000.

(Rehabilitation)

Various locations: Rehabilitation of facilities for family housing, \$2,861,000.

Outside continental United States

(Alaskan Area)

Big Delta: Troop housing and community facilities, and family housing, \$3,638,000.

Eielson Air Force Base: Maintenance and storage facility, \$1,047,000.

Ladd Air Force Base: Storage facilities and liquid fuel dispensing facilities, \$268,-000.

Fort Richardson: Troop housing, community facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$9,079,000.

Whittier: Community facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, \$1,183,-000.

Wildwood Station (Kenai): Troop housing and community facilities, \$469,000.

Various locations: Rehabilitation of facilities for family housing, \$1,656,000.

(Far East Command Area)

Okinawa: Community, troop supporting, and medical facilities, operational, maintenance, and administrative facilities, utilities, family housing, and land acquisition and resettlement, \$43,983,000, of which sum the total amount available for resettlement may be paid in advance to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands.

(Pacific Command Area)

Helemano, Hawaii: Family housing, \$714,-000.

Camp O'Donnell, Philippine Islands: Utilities, \$832,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Storage and community facilities, \$3,162,000.

Walawa (Walpo) Radio Transmitting Station: Hawaii: Community facilities and family housing, \$363,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Clayton, Canal Zone: Family housing, \$2,350,000.

(Icelandic Command Area)

Keflavik Airport: Operational and training facilities, and family housing, \$3,793,000.

Classified installations: Family housing, \$5,799,000.

Sec. 102. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by the acquisition of land and the construction, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment, in a total amount of \$223,993,000.

Sec. 103. The Secretary of the Army is authorized through the construction, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment, to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed in a total amount of \$10 million.

Sec. 104. Public Law 534, 82d Congress, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Strike so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Field Forces Facilities" (Second Army Area) in section 101 as follows:

"Fort Knox, Ky.: Training buildings and facilities, research and development facilities, maintenance facilities, land acquisition, and utilities, \$11,411,000."

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Fort Knox, Ky.: Training buildings and facilities, maintenance facilities, land acquisition, and utilities, \$9,411,000."

(b) Strike so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Technical Service Facilities" (Army Medical Service) in section 101 as follows:

"Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C.: Operational facilities and research and development facilities, \$731,000."

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C., and Forest Glen, Md.: Operational facilities, and research and development facilities, \$2,731,000."

Sec. 105. Public Law 534, 82d Congress, is hereby amended by striking so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "(Signal Corps)" in section 101 as follows:

"Department of the Army transmitting station, vicinity of Woodbridge, Va."

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Department of the Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Md."

TITLE II

Sec. 201. The Secretary of Navy is authorized to establish or develop naval installations and facilities by the acquisition, construction, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works in respect of the following projects, which include site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Shipyard facilities

Naval shipyard, Boston, Mass.: Utilities and replacement of piers, \$8,441,000.

Naval shipyard, Puget Sound, Bremerton, Wash.: Drydock facilities, \$200,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Md.: Research and development facilities, \$14,-302,000.

Naval industrial reserve shipyard, Charleston, S. C.: Land acquisition, \$427,000.

Naval minecraft base, Charleston, S. C.: Site preparation, waterfront facilities, administrative facilities, training facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$5,800,000.

Naval shipyard, Mare Island, Vallejo, Calif.: Waterfront facilities and sandblasting facilities, \$4,553,000.

Naval shipyard, Norfolk, Va.: Replacement of wharf, \$308,000.

Naval underwater sound laboratory, New London, Conn.: Family housing, \$68,800.

Naval mine countermeasures station, Panama City, Fla.: Administrative facilities, community facilities, training facilities, helicopter facilities, ammunition storage facilities, waterfront facilities, research and development facilities, and land acquisition, \$3,379,000.

Naval shipyard, Portsmouth, N. H.: Utilities and drydock facilities, \$946,000.

Naval electronics laboratory, San Diego, Calif.: Land acquisition, \$143,000.

Naval repair facility, San Diego, Calif.: Utilities, \$629,000.

Naval shipyard, San Francisco, Calif.: Waterfront facilities, steam test facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,369,000.

Fleet base facilities

Navy Department, District of Columbia: Family housing, \$81,000.

Naval station, Green Cove Springs, Fla.: Utilities, \$72,000.

Naval station, Newport, R. I.: Personnel facilities, \$1,583,000.

Naval base, Norfolk, Va.: Waterfront facilities, pavement, utilities, and land acquisition, \$9,972,000.

Naval station, Orange, Tex.: Personnel facilities, \$369,000.

Naval station, San Diego, Calif.: Utilities, \$57,000.

Naval station, Treasure Island, San Francisco, Calif.: Personnel facilities and utilities, \$3,147,000.

Naval station, Tacoma, Wash.: Waterfront facilities, \$3,024,000.

Naval station, Tongue Point, Astoria, Oreg.: Personnel facilities, \$92,000.

Aviation facilities

(Naval Air Training Station)

Naval auxiliary landing field, Alice-Orange Grove area, Tex.: Airfield pavements and land acquisition, \$1,487,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Barlin Field, Foley, Ala.: Airfield lighting facilities, \$151,-000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Tex.: Storage facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, land acquisition, and family housing, \$1,953,500.

Naval air station, Corpus Christi, Tex.: Navigational aids, training facilities, and land acquisition, \$664,000.

Naval air station, Glynco, Ga.: Aircraft, station and equipment maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$1,886,000.

Naval air station, Hutchinson, Kans.: Utilities, \$81,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Kingsville, Tex.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, operational facilities, navigational aids, storage facilities, maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$3,686,000.

Naval air station, Memphis, Tenn.: Utilities, \$759,000.

Naval air station, Pensacola, Fla.: Airfield pavements, navigational aids, personnel facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, research and development facilities, ammunition storage facilities, land acquisition, and plans and specifications for aircraft overhaul and repair facilities, \$3,453,-000.

Naval auxiliary air station: Port Isabel, Tex.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, operational facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, fuel storage facilities, ammunition storage and ordnance facilities, security facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$5,544,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, New Iberia, La.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, operational facilities, navigational aids, maintenance facilities, communication facilities, training facilities, administrative facilities, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, covered and cold storage facilities, ammunition storage facilities, personnel facilities, medical facilities, community facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$24,-361,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Whiting Field, Fla.: Family housing, \$385,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval air station, Alameda, Calif.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, seadrome lighting facilities, seawall, dredging, and land acquisition, \$3,729,000.

Naval air station, Atlantic City, N. J.: Storage facilities, and utilities, \$233,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Brown Field, Calif.: Family housing, \$214,600.

Naval air station, Brunswick, Maine: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, communication facilities, storage facilities, ammunition storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$3,200,000.

Naval air station, Cecil Field, Fla.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, operational facilities, covered storage facilities, ammunition storage and ordnance facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, security

facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,400,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, El Centro, Calif.: Ordnance facilities, and land acquisition, \$866,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nev.: Operational facilities, community facilities, family housing, and personnel facilities, \$1,172,700.

Naval air station, Jacksonville, Fla.: Airfield pavements, communication facilities, operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,224,000.

Naval air station, Key West, Fla.: Fuel storage facilities, and boathouse, \$211,000.

Naval auxiliary landing field, Mayport, Fla.: Waterfront facilities, communication facilities, family housing, and security facilities, \$812,000.

Naval air station, Miramar, Calif.: Storage facilities, training facilities, personnel facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,370,000.

Naval air station, Moffet Field, Calif.: Fuel pipeline facilities, airfield pavements, and operational facilities, \$2,581,000.

Naval air station, Norfolk, Va.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, communication facilities, operational facilities and land acquisition, \$5,260,000.

Naval air station, Oceana, Va.: Airfield pavement, storage facilities, personnel facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and fuel dispensing facilities, \$5,281,000.

Naval air station, Quonset Point, R. I.: Airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, \$1,062,000.

Naval air station, San Diego, Calif.: Training facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, and utilities, \$2,748,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Sanford, Fla.: Family housing, \$188,900.

Naval air facility, Weeksville, N. C.: Cold storage facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$342,000.

Naval air station, Whidbey Island, Wash.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, training facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,958,000.

Outlying field, Whitehouse Field, Duval County, Fla.: Airfield pavements, and land acquisition, \$1,087,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, S. C.: Airfield pavements, communications facilities, navigational aids, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,649,000.

Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, waterfront facilities, navigational aids, airfield lighting facilities, ammunition storage and ordnance facilities, operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,762,000.

Marine Corps air station, El Toro, Calif.: Airfield pavements, training facilities, communication facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,492,000.

Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Edenton, N. C.: Family housing, \$1,421,500.

Marine Corps air station, Miami, Fla.: Land acquisition, \$1,223,000.

Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Mojave, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, land acquisition, and family housing, \$2,305,400.

Marine Corps air facility, New River, N. C.: Airfield pavements, medical facilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, and utilities, \$2,762,000.

(Special purpose air stations)

Naval air facility, to be known as John H. Towers Field, Annapolis area, Md.: Operat-

tional facilities, administrative facilities, personnel facilities, airfield lighting facilities, airfield pavements, aircraft and station maintenance facilities, communication facilities, cold storage facilities, training facilities, storage facilities, utilities, medical facilities, petroleum storage facilities, site preparation, and land acquisition, \$16,900,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Chincoteague, Va.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and operational facilities, \$2,858,-000.

Naval ordnance test station, Inyokern, Calif.: Research and development facilities, \$2,615,000.

Naval air station, Lakehurst, N. J.: Research and development facilities, storage facilities, navigational aids, and aircraft maintenance facilities, \$16,311,000.

Naval air test center, Patuxent River, Md.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, oil storage facilities, and utilities, \$8,677,000.

Naval air missile test center, Point Mugu, Calif.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, communication facilities, and research and development facilities, \$926,000.

Naval air station, South Weymouth, Mass.: Testing facilities, \$270,000.

Naval photographic interpretation center, Suitland, Md.: Operational and photographic preservation facilities, \$2,345,000.

Various locations: Land acquisition, and obstruction removal, for flight clearance, \$23 million.

Supply facilities

Naval fuel depot, Jacksonville, Fla.: Family housing, \$15,200.

Naval supply depot, Newport, R. I.: Waterfront facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$1,041,000.

Naval supply center, Norfolk, Va.: Cold-storage facilities, warehouse freight elevators, and (at Cheatham Annex) highway crossing and land acquisition, \$777,000.

Naval supply center, Oakland, Calif.: Utilities, and easement, \$62,000.

Marine Corps facilities

Marine Corps supply center, Albany, Ga.: Storage facilities, community facilities, cold-storage facilities, personnel facilities, and utilities, \$8,157,000.

Marine Corps supply center, Barstow, Calif.: Storage facilities, community facilities, cold-storage facilities, personnel facilities, security facilities, and land acquisition, \$501,000.

Marine Corps base, Camp Lejeune, N. C.: Personnel facilities, security facilities, and utilities, \$1,059,000.

Marine Corps recruit depot, Parris Island, S. C.: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$1,654,000.

Marine Corps base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.: Utilities, \$648,000.

Marine Corps clothing depot, Annex No. 3, Philadelphia, Pa.: Utilities, \$30,000.

Marine Corps schools, Quantico, Va.: Covered and ammunition-storage facilities, medical facilities, training and personnel facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$9,357,000.

Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego, Calif.: Pavements, and personnel facilities, \$120,000.

Marine Corps training center, Twenty-nine Palms, Calif.: Family housing, \$47,300.

Ordnance facilities

Naval ammunition depot, Charleston, S. C.: Ordnance facilities, \$193,000.

Naval aviation ordnance test station, Chincoteague, Va.: Research and development facilities, \$644,000.

Naval ordnance aerophysics laboratory, Daingerfield, Tex.: Research and development facilities, \$1,111,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Earie, N. J.: Refrigerated storage facilities, \$59,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Fallbrook, Calif.: Ordnance and ammunition storage facilities, \$514,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Hawthorne, Nev.: Barreled sidings, and utilities, \$1,424,000.

Naval powder factory, Indian Head, Md.: Research and development facilities, and utilities, \$1,107,000.

Naval ordnance test station, Inyokern, Calif.: Community facilities, \$375,000.

Naval torpedo station, Keyport, Wash.: Ordnance facilities, \$376,000.

Naval ordnance plant, Louisville, Ky.: Ordnance drawings storage facilities, \$927,000.

Naval ordnance plant, Macon, Ga.: Ordnance manufacturing facilities, \$3,800,000.

Naval underwater ordnance station, Newport, R. I.: Testing facilities, \$370,000.

Naval magazine, Port Chicago, Calif.: Ordnance facilities, \$241,000.

Naval ammunition depot, St. Juliens Creek, Va.: Utilities, \$420,000.

Naval ammunition and net depot, Seal Beach, Calif.: Waterfront facilities, \$1,020,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Shumaker, Ark.: Barricaded transfer depot facilities, \$765,000.

Naval ordnance laboratory, White Oak, Md.: Research and development facilities, \$1,976,000.

Naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va.: Ammunition storage and testing facilities, \$113,000.

Service school facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Utilities, cadet housing, and fill in Dewey and Santee Basins in Severn River, \$11,467,000.

Naval station, Annapolis, Md.: Personnel facilities, \$307,000.

Naval receiving station, Charleston, S. C.: Community facilities, \$553,000.

Naval amphibious base, Coronado, Calif.: Personnel facilities, \$1,402,000.

Fleet air defense training center, Dam Neck, Va.: Training facilities, and personnel facilities, \$1,942,000.

Naval training center, Great Lakes, Ill.: Training facilities, family housing, and personnel facilities, \$8,038,800.

Naval powder factory, Indian Head, Md.: Personnel facilities, \$780,000.

Naval postgraduate school, Monterey, Calif.: Personnel facilities, \$119,000.

Naval receiving station, Philadelphia, Pa.: Personnel facilities, \$1,428,000.

Naval retraining command, Portsmouth, N. H.: Security facilities, \$42,000.

Fleet sonar school, San Diego, Calif.: Training facilities, \$2,753,000.

Medical facilities

National naval medical center, Bethesda, Md.: Plans and specifications for the Armed Forces Medical Library, \$350,000.

Naval hospital, Chelsea, Mass.: Family housing, \$192,800.

Naval hospital, Corona, Calif.: Family housing, and conversion of existing structures to family housing, \$256,800.

Naval hospital, Corpus Christi, Tex.: Family housing, \$162,100.

Naval hospital, Great Lakes, Ill.: Plans and specifications for certain medical facilities, \$750,000.

Naval hospital, Jacksonville, Fla.: Retaining wall, \$46,000.

Naval submarine base, New London, Conn.: Medical research facilities, \$755,000.

Naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.: Utilities, \$60,000.

Communications facilities

Naval radio station, Northwest, Va.: Communication facilities, \$436,000.

Office of naval research facilities

Naval research laboratory, Washington, D. C.: Research facilities, and utilities, \$163,-000.

Naval research laboratory, Chesapeake Bay Annex, Randle Cliffs, Md.: Research facilities, and land acquisition, \$52,000.

Yards and docks facilities

Naval construction battalion center, Davisville, R. I.: Waterfront facilities, and storage facilities, \$5,397,000.

Public works center, Norfolk, Va.: Utilities, \$2,510,000.

Naval construction battalion center, Port Hueneme, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, \$1,225,000.

Various locations: Facilities for abatement of water pollution, including the acquisition of land, \$15,149,000.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Shipyard facilities

Fleet activities, Sasebo, Japan: Personnel facilities, \$57,000.

Fleet base facilities

Naval station, Adak, Alaska: Family housing, \$2,485,000.

Naval base, Guam, Mariana Islands: Administrative facilities, \$1,835,000.

Naval base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$50,000.

Naval base, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands: Personnel facilities, medical facilities, utilities, and family housing, \$15,263,700.

Fleet activities: Yokosuka, Japan: Family housing, \$6,549,800.

Aviation facilities

Naval air station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, personnel facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$6,525,000.

Naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland: Operational facilities, and family housing, \$8,589,800.

Naval air station, Atsugi, Japan: Personnel facilities, and family housing, \$1,978,800.

Naval station, Bermuda, British West Indies: Aircraft maintenance facilities, \$91,000.

Naval air facility, Cubi Point, Philippine Islands: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, earthwork, personnel facilities, communication facilities, ordnance facilities, fuel-dispensing facilities, and utilities, \$8,260,000.

Naval air station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Fuel pipeline facilities, community facilities, utilities, and family housing, \$2,977,300.

Naval air facility, Iwakuni, Japan: Personnel facilities, \$975,000.

Marine Corps air station, Kaneohe Bay, T. H.: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, and family housing, \$3,227,600.

Naval station, Kodiak, Alaska: Family housing, \$2,618,100.

Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Communication facilities, ammunition storage facilities, and personnel facilities, \$4,411,000.

Naval station, Midway Island, T. H.: Communication facilities and operational facilities, \$1,518,000.

Naples, Italy: Operational facilities and storage facilities, \$155,000.

Naval air facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco: Cold-storage facilities, and family housing, \$1,958,500.

Naval station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities and airfield pavements, \$3,721,000.

Naval station, Sangley Point, Philippine Islands: Family housing, \$522,900.

Supply facilities

Naval supply depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Waterfront facilities and storage facilities, \$5,427,000.

Naval supply depot, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Cold-storage facilities, \$1,318,000.

Naval supply center, Pearl Harbor, T. H.: Operational facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$270,000.

Ordnance facilities

Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, T. H.: Testing facilities, and railroad facilities and barricades, \$1,132,000.

Naval ordnance facility, Sasebo, Japan: Personnel facilities, \$66,000.

Service school facilities

Fleet training center, Pearl Harbor, T. H.: Training facilities, \$44,000.

Medical facilities

Naval hospital, Guam, Mariana Islands: Community facilities, \$269,000.

Communication facilities

Naval communication station, Adak, Alaska: Communication facilities, \$439,000.

Naval radio facility, Kami-Seya, Japan: Communication facilities, and family housing, \$2,564,700.

Naval communication station, Kodiak, Alaska: Site preparation, communication facilities, maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, and utilities, \$6,991,000.

Naval communication facility, Philippine Islands: Communication facilities, community facilities, utilities, and family housing, \$8,061,500.

Naval communication facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco: Storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, utilities, and family housing, \$2,848,600.

Yards and docks facilities

Fifteenth Naval District, Canal Zone: Utilities, and acquisition of family housing, \$3,069,000.

Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities, \$940,000.

Sec. 202. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by the acquisition of land, and the construction, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities, equipment and family housing, in the total amount of \$151,342,400.

Sec. 203. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized through the construction, rehabilitation or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment, to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed in a total amount of \$6 million.

TITLE III

Sec. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized to establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by the acquisition, construction, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works in respect of the following projects, which include site preparation, appurtenances and related utilities, equipment and facilities:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Air Defense Command

Buckingham Weapons Center, Fort Myers, Fla.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, \$11,577,000.

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, \$1,200,000.

Ent Air Force Base, Colorado Springs, Colo.: Utilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, \$1,808,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vt.: Fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting, and utilities, \$213,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash.: Airfield pavements, troop housing, storage facilities, and family housing, \$1,716,000.

Glasgow site, Montana: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, \$4,706,000.

Grand Forks site, North Dakota: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, \$5,822,000.

Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mo.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, \$3,402,000.

Greater Milwaukee area, Wisconsin: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, \$16,608,000.

Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Coraopolis, Pa.: Training facilities, utilities, medical facilities, and personnel facilities, \$404,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, Calif.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, and personnel facilities, \$1,501,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, \$2,029,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Mich.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, utilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, relocation of facilities, and family housing, \$3,943,000.

Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Oreg.: Airfield pavements, relocation of facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and family housing, \$2,042,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Wash.: Airfield pavements, training facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and family housing, \$2,959,000.

McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tenn.: Airfield pavements, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, \$582,000.

Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport, Minneapolis, Minn.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, \$1,423,000.

Minot site, North Dakota: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, \$5,339,000.

New Castle County Municipal Airport, Wilmington, Del.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, \$504,000.

Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, N. Y.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative, and community facilities, and shop facilities, \$1,423,000.

- facilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, \$1,748,000.
- Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, messing facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, \$6,076,000.
 - Oxnard Air Force Base, Oxnard, Calif.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and administrative facilities, \$2,445,000.
 - Paine Air Force Base, Everett, Wash.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, \$1,039,000.
 - Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and family housing, \$2,056,000.
 - Selby Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Mich.: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, and personnel facilities, \$5,526,000.
 - Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, and messing facilities, \$343,000.
 - Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, N. Y.: Navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, storage facilities, and community facilities, \$112,000.
 - Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton, N. Y.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, \$2,207,000.
 - Traverse City area, Michigan: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, \$1,881,000.
 - Truax Field, Madison, Wis.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, \$1,263,000.
 - Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Mich.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, storage facilities, administrative facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, \$2,511,000.
 - Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, utilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, \$742,000.
 - Yuma County Airport, Yuma, Ariz.: Airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, personnel facilities, and administrative facilities, \$2,107,000.
- Air Materiel Command**
- Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Ala.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, \$4,170,000.
 - Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and family housing, \$15,803,000.
 - Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Airfield pavements, and airfield lighting facilities, \$2,386,000.
 - Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,945,000.
- McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, and administrative facilities, \$9,522,000.
- Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, Calif.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, \$3,205,000.
- Olmstead Air Force Base, Middletown, Pa.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, \$21,264,000.
- Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Ga.: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, and land acquisition, \$3,375,000.
- Searsport Air Force Tank Farm, Searsport, Maine: Fuel storage facilities, \$133,000.
- Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Okla.: Storage facilities, \$205,000.
- Wilkins Air Force Station, Shelby, Ohio: Utilities, \$305,000.
- Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Airfield pavements, training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, research and development facilities, and administrative facilities, \$18,001,000.
- Various locations: Storage facilities, \$170,-000.
- Air Proving Ground Command**
- Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Fla.: Airfield pavements, communications, and navigational aids, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, research, development and test facilities, and storage facilities, \$7,966,000.
- Air Training Command**
- Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Tex.: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 - Bryan Air Force Base, Bryan, Tex.: Troop housing and messing facilities, and utilities, \$914,000.
 - Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Ill.: Land acquisition, \$3,000.
 - Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Ala.: Airfield pavements, troop housing, and land acquisition, \$1,650,000.
 - Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Tex.: Troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, and medical facilities, \$2,816,000.
 - Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyo.: Troop housing and messing facilities, \$1,403,000.
 - Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Tex.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,081,000.
 - Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Miss.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, land acquisition, and personnel facilities, \$349,000.
 - Headquarters technical training, Air Force, Gulfport, Miss.: Acquisition of land and facilities, \$813,000.
 - Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Tex.: Communications and navigational aids and troop housing, \$446,000.
 - James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex.: Troop housing and messing facilities, \$883,000.
 - Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Tex.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, and family housing, \$1,525,500.
 - Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Tex.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, training facilities, land acquisition, and family housing, \$8,695,000.
 - Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colo.: Troop housing and messing facilities, \$1,217,000.
 - Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Ariz.: Training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,557,-000.
 - Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Communications and navigational aids, troop housing and messing facilities, and personnel facilities, \$1,516,000.
- McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kans.: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$104,000.
- Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Ga.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, and family housing, \$4,-322,000.
- Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nev.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, and troop housing and messing facilities, \$1,153,000.
- Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Tex.: Troop housing and messing facilities, and land acquisition, \$956,000.
- Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Troop housing, \$549,000.
- Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Tex.: Troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, and personnel facilities, \$1,076,-000.
- Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill.: Troop housing and messing facilities, \$1,247,000.
- Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Tex.: Messing facilities, \$80,000.
- Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nev.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, personnel facilities, and family housing, \$4,187,000.
- Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Fla.: Airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, \$478,-000.
- Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Okla.: Troop housing and messing facilities, and land acquisition, \$871,000.
- Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Tex.: Shop facilities, and family housing, \$2,410,-000.
- Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz.: Operational facilities, and troop housing and messing facilities, \$1,045,000.
- Air University**
- Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Ala.: Troop housing, \$275,000.
 - Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Ala.: Troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, and medical facilities, \$2,661,000.
- Continental Air Command**
- Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, Calif.: Land acquisition, personnel facilities, and family housing, \$2,125,500.
 - Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Troop housing, \$590,000.
 - Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Ga.: Airfield pavements, and personnel facilities, \$758,000.
 - Mitchell Air Force Base, Hempstead, N. Y.: Airfield pavements, \$1,891,000.
 - Wolters Air Force Base, Mineral Wells, Tex.: Operational facilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, \$331,000.
- Headquarters Command**
- Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.: Personnel facilities, \$520,000.
- Military Air Transport Service**
- Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md.: Medical facilities, and personnel facilities, \$1,098,000.
 - Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, S. C.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,032,000.
 - Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, land acquisition, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and family housing, \$7,073,000.
 - McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N. J.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, \$5,564,000.
 - Palm Beach Air Force Base, Palm Beach, Fla.: Operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing

facilities, utilities, and personnel facilities, \$818,000.

St. Louis Aeronautical Chart Information Center, St. Louis, Mo.: Administrative facilities, \$861,000.

Research and Developmnt Command
Carabelle Test Site, Carabelle, Fla.: Land acquisition, \$1,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, Calif.: Airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, research, development and test facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, \$12,429,000.

Hartford Research Facility, Hartford, Conn.: Research and development facilities, \$22,375,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, N. Mex.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, utilities, research and development facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, \$4,965,000.

Indian Springs Air Force Base (Kirtland Auxiliary No. 1), Clark, Nev.: Operational facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, \$555,500.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, and shop facilities, \$905,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, research and development facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, \$3,705,000.

Mount Washington Climatic Projects Laboratory, Mount Washington, N. H.: Research and development facilities, \$588,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Fla.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, research and development facilities, and shop facilities, \$7,600,000.

Various locations: Research, development, and operational facilities, \$20 million.

Strategic Air Command

Abilene Air Force Base, Abilene, Tex.: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and administrative and community facilities, \$4,214,000.

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Okla.: Fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and family housing, \$2,920,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La.: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, training facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, \$7,379,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Tex.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, utilities, land acquisition, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and shop facilities, \$1,770,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex.: Fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, troop housing, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, \$2,427,000.

Campbell Air Force Base, Hopkinsville, Ky.: Airfield pavements, communications, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and shop facilities, \$1,975,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex.: Airfield lighting facilities, troop housing, utilities, medical facilities, and personnel facilities, \$2,322,000.

Castile Air Force Base, Merced, Calif.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and administrative facilities, \$4,453,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Okla.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, \$10,208,500.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Miss.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, administrative facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, \$6,629,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Bass, Tucson, Ariz.: Airfield pavements, training facilities, troop housing, medical facilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, \$7,803,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, rehabilitation, land acquisition, personnel facilities, community facilities, and shop facilities, \$11,155,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, \$11,168,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Wash.: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, \$1,707,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans.: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, \$4,753,000.

Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Tex.: Troop housing, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, \$482,000.

Great Falls Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.: Airfield pavements, communications, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, \$5,435,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Fla.: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, \$4,428,000.

Hunter Air Force Base Savannah, Ga.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, medical facilities, and personnel facilities, \$4,115,000.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, La.: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, and personnel facilities, \$2,398,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebr.: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and administrative facilities, \$6,595,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Ark.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and family housing, \$5,317,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training

facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, \$8,571,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, \$2,930,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Fla.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, and personnel facilities, \$5,251,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, Calif.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, and personnel facilities, \$3,741,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and family housing, \$5,981,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.: Utilities, and land acquisition, \$128,000.

Pinecastle Air Force Base, Orlando, Fla.: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, \$4,118,000.

Plattsburg Air Force Base, Plattsburg, N. Y.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and family housing, \$21,988,000.

Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and family housing, \$24,850,000.

Sedalia Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Mo.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, \$9,646,000.

Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Salina, Kans.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, \$8,773,500.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, \$2,125,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Ga.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and land acquisition, \$3,744,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex.: Airfield pavements, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, \$5,259,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Mass.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, \$7,716,000.

Tactical Air Command

Alexandria Air Force Base, Alexandria, La.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities,

1955

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7935

operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, and personnel facilities, \$2,684,000.

Ardmore Air Force Base, Ardmore, Okla.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, \$6,800,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Ark.: Airfield lighting facilities, training facilities, utilities, storage facilities, and community facilities, \$208,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Ind.: Airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, and administrative facilities, \$559,000.

Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, N. Mex.: Training facilities, and family housing, \$2,570,500.

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, S. C.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, and medical facilities, \$2,403,000.

Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Tex.: Airfield pavements, training facilities, troop housing, and family housing, \$4,624,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, Calif.: Airfield pavements, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, \$1,598,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Va.: Airfield pavements, training facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and administrative facilities, \$3,384,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash.: Airfield pavements, utilities, medical facilities, and personnel facilities, \$3,574,000.

Myrtle Beach Municipal Airport, Myrtle Beach, S. C.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, \$6,303,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, N. C.: Airfield pavements, communications and navigational aids, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, and storage facilities, \$2,548,000.

Stewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tenn.: Airfield pavements, communications and navigational aids, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, personnel facilities, and administrative facilities, \$3,589,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, N. C.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, \$7,429,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, S. C.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, \$7,035,000.

Special facilities

Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$387,000.

Aircraft control and warning system

Various locations: Fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, operational facilities, training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, \$100,382,000.

*OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES**Alaskan Air Command*

Eielson Air Force Base: Medical facilities, storage facilities, and community facilities, \$1,307,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, \$23,275,000.

Galena Airfield: Airfield lighting facilities, and storage facilities, \$518,000.

Kenai Airfield: Airfield pavements, \$356,000.

Ladd Air Force Base: Training facilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, \$1,610,000.

Naknek Airfield: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, \$1,863,000.

Caribbean Air Command

Albrook Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Communication facilities, \$163,000.

Far East Air Forces

Various locations: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, \$42,017,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and harbor facilities, \$4,978,000.

Johnston Island Air Force Base: Johnston Island: Communication facilities, \$182,000.

Midway Island: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, and airfield lighting facilities, \$303,000.

Wake Island: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, and navigational aids, \$2,991,000.

Various locations: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, \$11,393,000.

Northeast Air Command

Various locations: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, storage facilities, and shop facilities, \$23,801,000.

Strategic Air Command

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and harbor facilities, \$2,149,000.

United States Air Forces in Europe

Various locations: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, \$234,996,000.

Area control navigational aids

Various locations: Communications and navigational aids, \$526,000.

Special facilities

Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$293,000.

Aircraft control and warning system

Various locations: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, shop facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, harbor facilities, and land acquisition, \$98,552,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized through the construction, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including site prep-

oration; appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment, to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed in a total amount of \$5 million.

SEC. 303. Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) With respect to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Strategic Air Command" in section 301 strike "\$2,248,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,750,000."

(b) With respect to Matagorda Island Air Force Range, Tex., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Strategic Air Command" in section 301 strike "\$807,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$847,000."

(c) With respect to Bismarck-Minot area, North Dakota, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "Bismarck-Minot area, North Dakota" and "\$6,494,000" and insert in lieu thereof "Minot Site, North Dakota" and "\$12,124,000", respectively.

(d) With respect to Fargo area, North Dakota, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "Fargo area, North Dakota" and "\$7,055,000" and insert in lieu thereof "Grand Forks Site, North Dakota" and "\$10,903,000"; respectively.

(e) With respect to Glasgow-Miles City area, Mont., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "Glasgow-Miles City, area, Montana" and "\$8,391,000" and insert in lieu thereof "Glasgow Site, Montana" and "\$10,660,000", respectively.

(f) With respect to K. I. Sawyer Airport, Marquette, Mich., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "\$8,556,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$9,949,000".

(g) With respect to Traverse City area, Michigan, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "\$8,835,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,267,000."

(h) With respect to Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Tex., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Training Command" in section 301 strike "\$1,073,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,478,000."

(i) With respect to Webb Air Force Base, Big Springs, Tex., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Training Command" in section 301 strike "\$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$135,-000."

(j) With respect to Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, Calif., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Materiel Command" in section 301 strike "\$4,308,000" and "\$2,183,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,735,000" and "\$2,-815,000", respectively.

(k) With respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Materiel Command" in section 301 strike "\$6,847,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,849,000".

(l) With respect to Atlantic City Consolair Station, Atlantic City, N. J., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "\$72,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$285,000".

(m) With respect to Nantucket Consolair Station, Nantucket, Mass., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "\$107,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$224,000".

(n) With respect to Pescadero Consolair Station, Pescadero, Calif., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section

June 27

301 strike "\$107,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$224,000."

(o) With respect to Point Conception Con-solan Station, Point Conception, Calif., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "\$72,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$232,000."

(p) In clause (3) of section 502 thereof delete the amounts "\$389,125,000" and "\$398,954,000" and insert in lieu thereof the amounts "\$405,176,000" and "\$415,005,000," respectively.

SEC. 304. Classified location: The authority granted by section 302, of the act of July 14, 1952, may be utilized to the extent of \$8,127,400 for the direct construction of family housing.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Secretary of a military department, is authorized to provide family housing for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and certain commissioned officers and enlisted personnel attached to his staff by the construction or rehabilitation of 5 units of family housing, and protected communication facilities, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision.

SEC. 402. Appropriations available to the military departments are hereby made available for the purposes of this title in an amount not to exceed \$300,000.

TITLE V

SEC. 501. The Director of Central Intelligence is authorized to provide for a headquarters installation for the Central Intelligence Agency by the acquisition of land at a cost of not to exceed \$6 million, and construction of buildings, facilities, appurtenances, utilities, and access roads at a cost of not to exceed \$50 million.

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are respectively authorized to proceed with the establishment or development of military and naval installations and facilities as authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV of this act, and the Director of Central Intelligence is authorized to proceed with the establishment of a Central Intelligence Agency Headquarters Installation as authorized by title V of this act, without regard to the provisions of sections 1136, 3648, and 3734, as respectively amended, of the Revised Statutes, and prior to approval of title to underlying land, as provided by section 355, as amended, of the Revised Statutes. The authority under this act of the Secretary of a military department to provide family housing includes authority to acquire such land as the Secretary concerned determines, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to be necessary in connection therewith. The authority to establish or develop such installations and facilities shall include, in respect of those installations and facilities as to which family housing or the acquisition of land is specified in titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this act, authority to make surveys and to acquire lands and rights and interests thereto or therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, and to place permanent or temporary improvements thereon whether such lands are held in fee or under lease or under other temporary tenure.

SEC. 602. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act, but not to exceed—

(1) for public works authorized by title I: Inside continental United States, \$238,778,-000; outside continental United States, \$78,-

334,000; section 102, \$223,993,000; section 103, \$10 million; or a total of \$551,105,000;

(2) for public works authorized by title II: Inside continental United States, \$331,-607,200; outside continental United States, \$107,191,300; section 202, \$151,342,400; section 203, \$6 million; or a total of \$598,140,-900;

(3) for public works authorized by title III: Inside continental United States, \$709,-480,000; outside continental United States, \$450,973,000; section 302, \$6 million; or a total of \$1,165,453,000; and

(4) for public works authorized by title IV: \$300,000.

(5) for public works authorized by title V: \$56 million.

SEC. 603. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in titles I, II, and III of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be varied upward by 5 percent in the case of projects within the continental United States, and 10 percent in the case of projects outside the continental United States, but the total cost of all projects so enumerated under each of such titles shall not exceed the total of all amounts specified in respect of projects in such title.

SEC. 604. Appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this act shall be available for expenses incident to construction, including surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision.

SEC. 605. Whenever—

(a) the President determines that compliance with the requirements of Public Law 245, 82d Congress, in the case of contracts made pursuant to this act with respect to the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of the provisions of this act; and

(b) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for conducting an adequate audit of such contracts, the President is authorized to exempt such contracts from the requirements of Public Law 245, 82d Congress.

SEC. 606. All contracts entered into by the United States pursuant to the authorization contained in this act shall be awarded, so far as practicable, if the interest of the national security shall not be impaired thereby and if such award is consistent with the provision of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 607. Section 407 of the Public Law 765, 83d Congress, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 407. The Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to construct, or acquire by lease of otherwise, family housing, in addition to family housing otherwise authorized to be constructed or acquired by the Department of Defense in foreign countries, by the expenditure of the \$100 million through the use of foreign currencies in accordance with the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"The Department of Defense shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for such family housing in a dollar amount equivalent to the value to the foreign currencies used pursuant to the authority contained in this section. For the purpose of such reimbursement, the Department of Defense may utilize appropriations otherwise available for the construction of military public works.

"The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives quarterly reports, the first of which shall be submitted 3 months subsequent to the date of enactment of this act, setting forth the

cost, number, and location of housing units constructed or acquired pursuant to the authority contained in this section during the 3-month period preceding the date of such report, and setting forth the cost, number, and location of the housing units intended to be constructed or acquired pursuant to such authority during the next succeeding quarter."

SEC. 608. All housing units constructed under the authority of this act shall be subject to the net floor area permanent limitations prescribed in the second, third, and fourth provisos of section 3 of the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 375), or in section 3 of the act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459), other than the first, second, and third provisions thereof: *Provided*, That such limitations shall not apply to the unit of family housing authorized by title IV of this act for the use of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, nor shall the limitations on the cost of family housing that are prescribed by section 608 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1958 (H. R. 6042) apply with respect to such units of family housing.

SEC. 609. When housing units are constructed under the authority of this act at installations at which housing units shall have been constructed and a mortgage thereon insured by the Federal Housing Commissioner pursuant to title VII of the National Housing Act, as amended, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, may, upon application by the mortgagor, accept on behalf of the Government the mortgagor's title to or leasehold interest in the housing units and underlying land, subject to the outstanding mortgage thereon, and assume the payments thereafter becoming due under any such outstanding mortgage and the cost of maintenance and operation thereafter accruing with respect to such housing units. Such housing units shall thereafter be under the jurisdiction of the military department concerned. The Secretary of the military department concerned may utilize appropriations otherwise available for construction of military public works for the liquidation of any outstanding mortgage assumed by the Government.

SEC. 610. As of July 1, 1958, all authorizations for military public works projects to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military, naval, or Air Force installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in acts approved prior to October 1, 1951, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except (1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in such acts in the titles that contain the general provisions, (2) authorizations for military public works projects as to which appropriated funds shall have been obligated in whole or in part prior to July 1, 1958, and authorizations for appropriations therefor, and (3) the authorizations with respect to military public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 829).

SEC. 611. Section 504 of Public Law 155, 82d Congress, is amended to read as follows: "Sec. 504. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, funds for advance planning, construction design, and architectural services in connection with public work projects which are not otherwise authorized by law."

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment, and that the bill be printed in the RECORD in its entirety at this point.

1955

7937

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statistics which have recently been published by the Pentagon concerning contract awards to the 100 largest prime contractors. You will remember than on January 11, 1954, the Department of Defense issued a report, cumulative in nature, showing data on contracts made during the period July 1950 through June 1953.

The report showed that a total of \$98,723,000,000 had been awarded in prime contracts during the period. It showed that 64 percent or \$63,165,000,000 had been awarded to 100 companies and corporate groups.

It showed that the General Motors Corp., through 32 of its divisions, had contracts amounting to \$7,095,800,000, or 7.2 percent of the \$98.7 billion total.

The next nine, in order of rank, were:

Company	Millions of dollars	Percent of total
Boeing Airplane Co.	\$4,402.9	4.4
General Electric Co.	3,459.2	3.6
Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.	2,867.8	2.9
United Aircraft Corp.	2,816.4	2.8
Chrysler Corp.	2,199.9	2.2
Lockheed Aircraft Corp.	2,152.1	2.2
Consolidated Vultee Aircraft	2,072.1	2.1
North American Aviation, Inc.	1,931.6	2.0
Republic Aviation Corp.	1,877.7	1.9

Significantly, this report carried a blocked-in space which reads:

This is the final issue in this series of reports, which has covered 3 fiscal years of expanded procurement activity following the start of the Korean conflict. The report is being discontinued for economy reasons.

During the remainder of 1954, despite many requests for current information on the large prime contractors, the Pentagon failed to make this information available to the public.

On May 16, 1955, the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Supply and Logistics—issued an "Analysis of large military prime contractors in the period from July 1, 1953 to December 31, 1954." The transmittal letter explained that this report is for the 18-month period only and is not cumulative as the former reports had been. About \$16 billion in contracts had been awarded and the 10 largest contractors with their percentages of the total, \$16 billion, follow:

Company	Millions of dollars	Percent of total
United Aircraft Corp.	\$1,061.4	6.5
Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.	1,041.8	6.4
North American Aviation, Inc.	910.2	5.6
Boeing Airplane Co.	764.9	4.7
Lockheed Aircraft Corp.	740.8	4.5
General Dynamics Corp.	597.9	3.7
Grumman Aircraft Engineering	377.1	2.3
Curtiss-Wright Corp.	340.1	2.1
Republic Aviation Corp.	329.5	2.0
Hughes Tool Co.	313.3	1.9

Now, I do not know why the format of the report was changed. General

Motors, for example, lost its preeminence and was dropped from the No. 1 ranking on the January 11, 1954 report to almost obscurity on the May 16, 1955 report. Actually, I would think that the former chairman of the General Motors Corp. would have been hurt at this drop in rank and prestige with his well-known economic-political philosophy on "what is good for what." When I read that report my heart really went out in sympathy for General Motors. I could not understand why Charles Wilson as Secretary Wilson should discriminate against this company. But as we view the real statistics the picture is different. So that the statistics might be consistent, I have added the last report to the former and have again made the rankings on a cumulative basis. For the period from July 1, 1950 through December 31, 1954, the total awards were \$115,060,200,000. The order of ranking of the 10 largest is as follows:

Company	Cumulative total	
	Millions of dollars	Percent
General Motors Corp.	7,034.9	6.8
Boeing Airplane Co.	5,167.8	4.49
Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.	3,909.6	3.4
United Aircraft Corp.	3,877.8	3.3
General Electric Co.	3,672.5	3.19
Lockheed Aircraft Corp.	2,892.9	2.5
North American Aviation, Inc.	2,841.8	2.4
Curtiss-Wright Corp.	2,086.3	1.8
American Telephone & Telegraph Co.	1,755.3	1.5
Ford Motor Co.	1,663.2	1.4

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. It is my understanding, and it was brought out in general debate during the \$31½ billion appropriation bill for the Department of Defense, that 85 percent of these contracts are let by negotiation and not by competitive bids; is that right?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I do this simply to ask the majority leader—so what? General Motors today has more than 10 percent of all the machinery of these industries producing war goods. If we want to get our war goods produced and produced on time, shall we ignore the largest, most efficient industrial producing company in the world and say, "Because you are so large we cannot give you anything at all; we will go out and organize new companies to produce these goods with consequent delay, and so forth?"

In my opinion that is all nonsense. I am sure you will find that the contracts let for war production will be let in proportion to the size of these industries that will be named. This one, being the largest, we will say will have 7 percent; this one, being the next largest, we will say will have 5 percent; and so on down the line.

What is wrong with that? That is the reason this administration has men who know how to get things done when we need them done.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. First of all, I want to raise the question as to the appropriateness of the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] during this military construction bill. I am sure those companies he mentioned are not involved, and are not going to be involved in the construction that this bill contemplates. Secondly, I want to correct the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Bass] which statement he has made on this floor a number of times and compounded his error by the repetition, that 85 percent of the defense contracts are let on a basis of negotiation.

One particular phase of the aircraft program was mentioned on this floor as being done upon that basis. If the gentleman from Tennessee wants to take the responsibility of opening up the many complicated phases of aircraft research and development and materiel development in the field of aircraft procurement to anyone who desires to bid, whether they be foreign, whether they be American, whether they be responsible or otherwise, that will be his responsibility.

I have not heard anything on the floor to indicate that he is so much interested in competitive free enterprise in this country to be sure he would want to do that. In fact, some of the things he had to say in connection with the appropriation bill affecting the Tennessee Valley Authority and the contracts relating to it here a couple of weeks ago led me to question seriously whether he really is interested in free competitive enterprise in this country.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I end up by saying, So what?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of drawing this into a personal debate. However, since the gentleman has seen fit to question my authority and my motives regarding certain statements I have made on the floor I feel that I should rise to defend myself.

It always seems to be a point of personal defense against any subject being discussed to attack anyone who seems to be interested in TVA. I am proud to be recognized among the TVA adherents. I would like to invite the gentleman from Wisconsin to come down and inspect that great development sometime, and perhaps he would learn a few things that he does not know about this great country of ours.

As far as the 85-percent figure is concerned that I gave on the floor here under direct questioning of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, he made the statement that 85 percent of the money spent under that bill for material procurement was through negotiation. As far as competitive bidding is concerned to the aircraft companies, and so forth re-

June 27

lating to security I picked up a newspaper the other day and saw where the Russians already had all of the engineering plans and the scale drawing of an airplane that was classified as absolutely secret by our Defense Department, and they had had it for some 4 months and it had been published in a newspaper in Russia.

I believe we have but a very small percentage of our defense appropriation spent on secret materiel. Under those conditions, I believe it should be negotiated. I agree with the majority leader. I do not know particularly that General Motors should be awarded 7 percent of our defense contracts simply because, as I have heard said, they have a negotiator on each side of the table. At any rate, I firmly believe we could save at least 10 to 15 percent of the money we spend on defense every year if our contracts were awarded on a competitive basis.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It amuses me to see how sensitive some Members are when you mention the name of General Motors, when you simply state the facts to show that they still are the largest prime contractor on defense contracts by far, by at least 33½ percent above the next company.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Dealing in the same type of enterprise.

Mr. McCORMACK. They ask, "So what?" What about the small independent businessmen of this country? What about them? How much are they being awarded? What consideration are they receiving as a result of these large contracts? How much are they cut down in their contracts?

What about the mergers going on, more mergers by 300 percent during any one of the last 3 years than took place in the largest year during the two decades prior to that? Those are some of the questions the gentleman from Illinois, my friend Mr. MASON, should also consider. So when we take the floor to tell the facts in cumulative form showing that General Motors has not been discriminated against, my good friend gets very sensitive; and the more he gets sensitive the better I like it.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. We do not want General Motors to be discriminated against, certainly not, but at the same time we do not want other companies to be discriminated against.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not at all sensitive about the remarks that have been made. I am sure the gentleman was not referring to me when he used those terms. But I do not like to see errors compounded on the floor of this House by people who are not acquainted with the facts. I am just as sure, as I am of the fact that I am standing here, and I happen to serve on the same subcommittee and heard the same information which the gentleman from Texas did, and the statement made by the gentleman from Texas was entirely correct

about the 85 percent because it related to the aircraft procurement of the Department of Defense. Shortly thereafter, under circumstances that did not permit correction at that particular moment, the gentleman from Tennessee who just addressed the House referred to five-sixths of the entire \$32½ billion appropriation in the Defense Department appropriation bill, something that was ridiculous on its face. There is too much in that amount which is not contracted for at all, which cannot be a matter of negotiation.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman so that the gentleman can correct himself.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I referred to that part of it which is used for material and procurement.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Then, if you had not made a statement about the five-sixths of \$31½ billion, you would have been correct. I am glad to see that you are correcting the impression that you created in the statement made on the floor of the House in relation to it.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit me to say, of course, we realize that part of the \$31½ billion is for salaries of personnel and many other things. I am talking about that part of the \$31½ billion which is spent for material and procurement.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am glad to give the gentleman an opportunity to correct himself.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 34, line 18, strike out the colon and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "Air base to be known as 'Richard Bong Air Force Base'."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, we have accepted that amendment, and I would suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin that at this point he insert a statement in regard to the outstanding achievements of this great aviator.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, it is a real privilege and an honor for me to suggest that the Greater Milwaukee area air base proposed for Kansaville, Wis., which is in my congressional district, should be designated as the Richard Bong Air Force Base in honor of this Wisconsin boy who was an ace of aces in World War II. He achieved the greatest combat record for destroying enemy airplanes during the war in the Pacific of any other American.

It is fitting and proper, therefore, that I propose an amendment to H. R. 6829, which would authorize the establishment of this base, and which when completed will bear the name of this outstanding Wisconsin hero.

I am indebted to the distinguished Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. VINSON, for his approval

of my amendment and to the distinguished minority leader on the Republican side [Mr. SHORT] for a similar courtesy which he has extended.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks I am setting down for posterity a statement of the military service of Richard Ira Bong, who was born on the 24th day of September 1920, at Superior, Wis., and whose mother and father still reside at Poplar, Wis.

Aviation cadet, May 29, 1941; second lieutenant, AC, Reserve, January 9, 1942; first lieutenant, Army of the United States, AC, April 6, 1943; first lieutenant, Army of the United States, August 9, 1943; captain, Army of the United States, AC, August 24, 1943; captain, Army of the United States, February 24, 1944; major, Army of the United States, AC, April 12, 1944; major, Army of the United States, August 1, 1944; first lieutenant, AC, Reserve, January 9, 1945.

Rating: Pilot.

SERVICE

Richard Ira Bong enlisted in the Regular Army at Wausau, Wis., on May 29, 1941, in the grade of flying cadet. He was assigned service number 16022192 and transferred to Tulara, Calif., where he completed his primary pilot training on August 16, 1941. From August 19, 1941, until October 31, 1941, he was assigned to Gardner Field, Calif., receiving his basic pilot training. He received his advance pilot training at Luke Field, Ariz., from November 4, 1941, to January 9, 1942, on which date he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Air Corps Reserves, and rated pilot.

After receiving his commission he was immediately called to extended active duty with the Air Corps and given an assignment as flying instructor at Luke Field, Ariz. On May 2, 1942, he was transferred to Hamilton Field, Calif., for combat training in P-38 type aircraft. Successfully completing this transition training early in September 1942 he was alerted for foreign service and departed the United States via air for duty in the Pacific area. Upon arrival in Australia he was assigned to the 9th Fighter Squadron, 49th Fighter Group, as combat fighter pilot. On November 14, 1942, he was reassigned to the 39th Fighter Squadron, 35th Fighter Group and destroyed 5 enemy aircraft before being returned to the 9th Fighter Squadron on January 11, 1943. He continued as fighter pilot with this organization flying P-38 type aircraft until November 11, 1943, when he was given 60 days leave and reassigned to Headquarters, 5th Fighter Command in New Guinea as Assistant A-3 in charge of replacement airplanes. While holding this assignment Major Bong continued flying combat missions and increased his individual total enemy aircraft destroyed to 28.

In April 1944, he was returned to the United States and assigned to the Matagorda Peninsula Bombing Range, Foster Field, Tex., for the purpose of receiving and checking on the latest gunnery methods and instructions. In September 1944, Major Bong returned to his assignment with the 5th Fighter Command in the Pacific Area and was placed in charge of gunnery training with that organization. In addition to his duties as gunnery instructor, though not required or expected to perform combat duty, he voluntarily flew 30 more combat missions over Borneo and the Philippine Islands, destroying 12 more enemy aircraft, bringing his total to 40 enemy aircraft destroyed. For his achievements during this second tour of overseas duty, Major Bong was awarded the Nation's highest decoration, the Medal of Honor. After completing over 200 combat missions for a total of over 500 combat hours, he was released from his assignment with

1955

7939

the 5th Fighter Command in December 1944 and returned to the United States.

Upon his return to the United States, Major Bong was assigned as test pilot with the 4020th Army Air Force Base Unit at Wright Field, Ohio, making functional tests and ferrying missions in single and twin engine fighter-type aircraft. On June 23, 1945, he was transferred to Burbank, Calif., and given an assignment as Chief of Flight Operations, Office of the Army Air Force Plant representative, in the Lockheed Aircraft Plant. Since this company was engaged in the development and manufacture of the new P-80 Jet-type aircraft, Major Bong received a full training course prescribed for this type airplane at Muroc Lake Flight Test Base, Calif.

Major Bong was killed on August 6, 1945, when the P-80 aircraft he was flying crashed near Burbank, Calif., due to power failure, reasons unknown.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Marjorie Ann Bong, whose last known address is 5640 Franklin Avenue, Hollywood, Calif. He is also survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Carl T. Bong, Poplar, Wis.

AWARDS

Medal of Honor, War Department General Orders 90, December 8, 1944.

Distinguished Service Cross, General Orders 62, Headquarters, USAFFE, October 20, 1943.

Silver Star with one Oak Leaf Cluster; Silver Star, General Orders 2, Headquarters, 5th Fighter Command, January 24, 1943; first Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 287, Headquarters 5th Air Force, November 19, 1943.

Distinguished Flying Cross with six Oak Leaf Clusters: Distinguished Flying Cross, General Orders 110, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, June 14, 1943; first Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 135, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, June 28, 1943; second Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 104, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, February 22, 1944; third Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 116, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, March 1, 1944; fourth Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 139, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, March 15, 1944; fifth and sixth Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 345, Headquarters, FEAF, December 28, 1944.

Air Medal with 14 Oak Leaf Clusters: Air Medal, General Orders 22, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, April 23, 1943; 1st Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 186, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, August 26, 1943; 2d through 9th Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 287, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, November 19, 1943; 10th Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 117, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, March 2, 1944; 11th Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 131, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, March 11, 1944; 12th Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 262, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, April 28, 1944; 13th Oak Leaf Cluster and 14th Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 345, Headquarters, FEAF, December 28, 1944.

Australian Distinguished Flying Cross.

American Defense Service Medal.

World War II Victory Medal.

American Campaign Medal.

Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with one Silver Service Star for participation in the Leyte, Luzon, New Guinea, northern Solomons, and Papua campaigns.

Distinguished Unit Citation Emblem with one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Philippine Liberation Ribbon with one Bronze Service Star.

Philippine Republic Presidential Unit Citation Emblem.

Philippine Independence Ribbon.

Aviation Badge "Pilot."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to add my own words of appreciation both to the gentleman from Wisconsin, my colleague, in whose district this base is to be located for his amendment which would name this installation after this greatest of all Wisconsin military heroes in modern times. I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member for their agreement on this highly appropriate amendment at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished majority leader, my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], said something that rather touched me personally where it is tender, when he said that we on the Republican side get a little sensitive whenever the name of General Motors is mentioned.

It so happens that I have four or five General Motors factories in my district. My memory is not so short but what I remember well that during the last war Detroit, Mich., and that area was known as the arsenal of democracy. We made the things, the sinews of war, that were needed to defend ourselves and the freedom of this world. General Motors did its full share, a major share in that program of production and the people of Michigan which I represent were proud of that record.

The statement has been made which, in my judgment, brings into disrepute and gives the impression that there is something dishonest about the contracts which are made with General Motors.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], said something about General Motors having negotiators on both sides of the table. It so happens that I know Mr. Charles E. Wilson, and I defy anybody on either side of the aisle to point to one dishonest, one unmanly thing that he has ever committed in public or private life. He is a man of integrity, highest character, great ability and is making a terrific sacrifice to serve our country. If we are to attract men and women of public spirit and ability we must treat them fairly. It so happens that General Motors has factories all over this country, and naturally the contracts are given to them. I am surprised that the number and percentage is as low as it is, when you consider that General Motors has factories which can do the job all over this country. And it must also be remembered that hundreds of small, independent companies contribute to the work through subcontracts. What is wrong about that?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I will let you explain to the House in your own time about having negotiators on both sides of the table.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I did not mention the name of the Defense Secretary. You are the one who mentioned his name; nor did I intend to attack his honesty or integrity to any degree.

Mr. DONDERO. But no one on this floor who knows anything about the fine man who is at the head of our Defense Department could possibly get any other impression except that you were pointing the finger of scorn and dishonesty at Mr. Wilson of the Defense Department. I hope the gentleman will clear that up.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I would also like to remind the gentleman there are several former General Motors' employees in the Department of Defense, so I am told.

Mr. DONDERO. That may be, but they do not control the making of contracts. I have never heard anything or seen anything in the public press that the contracts which General Motors gets from the Federal Government were unfairly obtained. I am amazed how low the percentage is, and what it means to the economy of this country. Let us keep this thing above the belt and be fair to a great company that has made its vast contribution to the welfare of our country, and especially in time of need, when we needed the materials of war to defend ourselves. War material contracts are generally urgent and must be made to secure prompt delivery. They must also be adequately contracted. Surely you would not spend the people's money inefficiently or improperly.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], ought to do some explaining. He says he did not mean the Secretary of Defense but some other employees of General Motors. I think we ought to get that clear, because if there are any employees of General Motors who are acting as negotiators for General Motors and not the United States Government, and there is collusion involved, we ought to know about it. If the gentleman has any information, he ought to name those people. I come from Michigan, and I am proud of General Motors. And I am proud of the employees who work for them.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If you will let me correct you, I said "former" employees of General Motors.

Mr. CEDERBERG. How are they on both sides of the table?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I do not have to explain that to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Well, you ought not to make statements if you cannot back them up.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentlemen who are involved in this controversy will answer in their own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dondero] has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Smith].

June 27

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: Re-number section 609 as section 609 (a) and after the end thereof add the following new section 609 (b):

"(b) The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are respectively authorized to acquire by purchase housing units which are located near military installations, which are adequate and suitable for housing military personnel and their dependents, and as to which a mortgage is insured by the Federal Housing Commissioner pursuant to title VI or title IX of the National Housing Act, subject to the outstanding mortgage thereon, and to assume the payments thereafter becoming due on such mortgage. The Secretary of the military department concerned may utilize appropriations available for the construction of military public works for the liquidation of any outstanding mortgage assumed by the Government."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to lodge discretionary authority in the three Secretaries so that, if in their judgment the facts and circumstances warrant it, they may acquire houses that have been built under title VI and title IX of the FHA Act. It is not mandatory; it just gives the Secretary of Defense an opportunity to look over the field in the location where he needs housing and see what he may be able to buy instead of build.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Does this language include the possibility of the Defense Department taking over Lanham Act houses that are being closed out?

Mr. VINSON. No; it does not permit that. This is a business proposition which permits the Secretary, where the facts and circumstances warrant it, to negotiate for the purchase of these FHA-insured houses that meet the requirements standards of the armed services. It is purely discretionary authority, that is all.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an excellent amendment. I offered substantially this same amendment in the Committee on the Armed Services and there was considerable debate in reference to this and another amendment offered by one of my colleagues. In the end we did not vote on the amendment; but this, I think, is an excellent amendment, and it does permit the defense departments to utilize housing which might be available to the United States Government if it meets all of the requirements.

I think we ought to give the Defense Department this opportunity to take advantage of what is available to us, some of which might otherwise be handled at a direct loss to our taxpayers. I am therefore very much in favor of the amendment and see no objection to it. I hope the other Members agree with me in this respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, there are no further amendments from the committee.

(Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks just made.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, this military construction bill before us at this time is on the whole a good bill. The committee has worked long and arduous hours in going into detail on this measure.

I want to congratulate the chairman, the Honorable CARL VINSON, for the special effort that he has placed on this bill. I doubt if there is a person in the United States, in the service or out, that has a better understanding of the various military installations of our country than does the gentleman from Georgia.

This bill calls for a great deal of money, perhaps too much. We have in the past spent enormous sums of money on our various military installations, and at times in the past I fear this money has been spent in a haphazard manner—without the proper planning and end in view. This condition is excusable during a war. We are now attempting to work toward a definite goal, a goal that will provide proper installations for our Armed Services at home and abroad, and in a sufficient capacity for our permanent defense forces.

I hope and believe that now we have arrived at a construction program where we can see diminishing expenditures within a few years. Much of the money in this bill is for family and troop housing. Proper living quarters and conditions should go a long way toward making the Armed Services more attractive as a career and encourage reenlistments. We hope that the services can be so attractive that in the foreseeable future we can do away with the draft and depend upon purely voluntary Armed Forces.

Many people believe that we are spending too much money for the construction and improvement of our air, Army and naval bases. If we are going to have peace which will last for many years, we are spending too much money, but if we are faced with war in the foreseeable future, and I am one who believes that we are not, then the money which we have spent on military construction is well worthwhile. It is something on which none of us want to gamble.

It is only human that we should make errors on this program, but on the whole I want to assure you that we are working toward a definite and foreseeable goal. I want to be fair with you, however, and state that there are items in this bill which I believe are unnecessary, items to which I and some other Members of the committee are opposed. One special item which I want to mention is the authorization for Camp Carson, Colo. This camp has at the present time all the facilities necessary to take care of all of the troops there. Yet, the Army has now launched a program with plans to spend over \$200 million on this post.

The plan is to keep all of the present buildings on the post in a state of readiness and repair and, in addition, to ultimately spend over \$200 million on new construction. This planned program, if finally carried out, will result in twice the number of buildings at Camp Carson than is necessary.

The principal excuse the Army gave for this great expansion and expenditure for Camp Carson is that it is used as a support base for Camp Hale, some 80 miles away in the mountains. Camp Hale is used for the winter training of Army units. There are but few permanent buildings there, and few are contemplated. Camp Hale could be supported from many other locations. It is not necessary to expend \$200 million on a permanent fort to support a mountain camp that is only used a few months a year. In addition, there is a shortage of water at Colorado Springs, where Camp Carson is located. Also, the Air Force is constructing its new Air Academy in the same location. This will further tax the already low water supply. There are many reasons why a military camp the size of Camp Carson should not be located and expanded in the immediate vicinity of the Air Force Academy, reasons which are apparent to anyone acquainted with the situation.

The chairman of the committee, Hon. CARL VINSON, pointed out many objectionable features to expanding this camp. On page, 3742 of the hearings he said of this authorization for Camp Carson:

And we are going to spend \$140 million to \$175 million to build up an Air Academy. • • •

We are building it. And here comes along Camp Carson, right in that neighborhood. And now you want to expand it. • • • So I don't think we should expand Carson one iota.

I have spoken in committee, as well as on the floor against the authorizations for Camp Carson. However, I realize it is unfair to vote against this entire bill just because of improper items contained therein. This is merely an authorization bill, and I trust in the future this expansion of Camp Carson can be stopped either by the Department of Defense, the Army, or the Appropriations Committee.

Some of the members of the committee also unsuccessfully opposed the expansion of Fort Sill. In this bill Fort Sill is authorized to take approximately 30,000 acres from the Wichita Mountains wildlife and game refuge and neighboring communities. This wildlife refuge is one of the finest in the country and is visited by many thousands daily. The local communities were bitter against this annexation. Fort Sill already has 74,000 acres. I, for one, believe this expansion was unnecessary. However, the majority of the committee thought otherwise. It is only natural that there will be differences of opinion on a bill of this magnitude.

I want to point out again that while there are parts of this bill that I cannot agree with, on the whole bill is good, and I believe it is planned and coordinated toward a sane and well-balanced defense.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I am voting "present" on the rollcall on H. R. 6829, authorizing construction for the military departments and the Central Intelligence Agency.

To me, this is the only sound position open because I have not been able to find in the extensive hearings and the report the facts I feel I need in order to pass on this \$2.36 billion authorization for the purchase of more real estate by the Department of Defense, which already holds properties costing more than \$24.8 billion with some of it being carried at ridiculously low acquisition costs. This holding comprises 61 percent of the acquired real property of the United States Government. In addition, the Department of Defense leases 190 locations including 1,983,686 acres for which it pays an annual rental of \$19,697,000.

I cannot say that the armed services do not need every facility provided in the bill before us today—but, after reading the hearings, I do have some reasonable doubts. Neither can I say that the armed services do need these facilities and this land in every case.

In the brief of authorizations, under title I, the Army lists \$223,993,000, or 40 percent, of its construction authorizations as "classified." The Navy, under title II, lists \$151,342,400, or about 25 percent of its construction funds as "classified." I am pleased that the Air Force seems more detailed and forthright in its justifications throughout and does not hide behind the term "classified" for projects most of which are being built right here in the United States, where all our citizens can observe daily the steam shovels, bulldozers, and steel-workers working on the projects so carefully "classified" from Congress.

I have been unable to discover just what is the construction included in title IV for the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Evidently this \$300,000 did not appear in the original H. R. 5700 as introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], at least not in title IV where it is now. Is this a house for Admiral Radford? Is it an elite housing project to provide for his personal staff, too? How many facilities can you provide for an admiral for \$300,000. I am not saying that this is necessarily either an unwise or an unjustified expenditure; I would just like to know what it is for and what we get for the money. Such items as "Chairman, JCS, \$300,000," do not explain to me what use is to be made of the taxpayers' money any more than I can be completely satisfied with general phrases such as "Operational and maintenance facilities," "Community facilities," and "Storage facilities," as justifications for the expenditure of billions of dollars.

I do not know whether the CIA needs a \$6 million building site and a \$50 million building, or not. I do not know or have any idea of how many employees CIA now has. I do not know what they do or to whom they are really accountable. Perhaps if I knew these things I would want to increase the CIA construction authorization, but I guess I will never know. Perhaps those of us in Congress will, someday, create a Joint Committee on Intelligence to provide congressional

guidance to CIA modeled on that which the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has developed in its field. Certainly we exercise no controls over this super secret agency through a check on the purse strings.

The Committee on Armed Services deserves due credit for their application and diligent work on this piece of legislation. The hearings total 4,091 pages, accumulated in approximately 50 hours and 25 minutes of on-the-record hearings spread over 21 days. Rapidly calculating, I estimate that the committee considered this authorization at about the rate of \$789,666 per minute of open hearing time, an evidence of unusual efficiency especially when you consider that their considerations ranged from Alaska to the Midway Islands including the British West Indies, the Canal Zone, Cuba, French Morocco, Hawaii, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Johnson Island, Mariana Islands, and the Marshall Islands in between. Without being able to tell what went on in the off-the-record hearings, one can wish the Army and Navy had justified their requests as forthrightly as the Air Force.

The Army will be authorized \$551,105,000 in this bill as contrasted with \$236 million granted in fiscal 1955—an increase of over 100 percent. The Navy will be authorized \$596,140,900 in this bill to accomplish public works as compared with about \$202 million for fiscal 1955, an increase of well over 100 percent. The Air Force will be authorized \$1,165,456,000 in this bill, an increase of more than 300 percent over last year's authorization of \$398,954,000.

Is this too much, or is it too little? Can we use this real estate instead of weapons against an enemy? I just do not know. On the basis of the information furnished me I have no way of reaching a sensible conclusion. So, I voted "Present."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. METCALF, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 283, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on final passage I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 316, nays 2, answering "present" 2, not voting 114, as follows:

	[Roll No. 97]
	YEAS—316
Abbitt	Fernandez
Abernathy	Fine
Addonizio	Fisher
Alger	Fjare
Allen, Ill.	Flood
Andersen	Flynt
H. Carl	Fogarty
Andresen,	Forand
August H.	Ford
Andrews	Forrester
Arends	Fountain
Ashley	Frazier
Ashmore	Friedel
Aspinall	Gary
Auchincloss	Gavin
Avery	Gentry
Ayers	George
Baker	Gordon
Baldwin	Grant
Bass, N. H.	Green, Oreg.
Bass, Tenn.	Gregory
Bates	Griffiths
Baumhart	Gross
Beamer	Gwynn
Belcher	Haley
Bell	Hand
Bennett, Fla.	Harden
Bennett, Mich.	Hardy
Bentley	Harris
Berry	Harrison, Va.
Betts	Hays, Ark.
Biatnik	Hays, Ohio
Boggs	Hayworth
Bolling	Hebert
Bolton,	Henderson
Frances P.	Herlong
Bow	Hess
Bowler	Hlestand
Boyle	Hill
Bray	Hillings
Brooks, La.	Hinshaw
Brown, Ga.	Hoffman, Mich.
Brown, Ohio	Holfeld
Bryohill	Holmes
Buchanan	Hope
Budge	Hosmer
Burleson	Huddleston
Burnside	Hull
Bush	Hyde
Byrd	Jarman
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenkins
Cannon	Jennings
Carlyle	Jensen
Carnahan	Johansen
Carriig	Johnson, Calif.
Cederberg	Jones, Ala.
Celler	Jones, N. C.
Cheif	Judd
Chenoweth	Karsten
Chipperfield	Keating
Christopher	Kelley, Pa.
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.
Church	Keogh
Clark	Kilburn
Clevenger	Kilday
Cole	Kilgore
Colmer	King, Calif.
Cooley	Kirwan
Coon	Kluczynski
Cooper	Krueger
Corbett	Landrum
Coudert	Lane
Cramer	Lanham
Cretella	Lankford
Crumpacker	Latham
Cunningham	LeCompte
Curtis, Mass.	Lipscomb
Curtis, Mo.	Long
Dague	McCarthy
Davis, Ga.	McCormack
Davis, Wis.	McCulloch
Dawson, Ill.	McDonough
Dawson, Utah	McDowell
Deane	McMillan
Delaney	McVey
Dempsey	Macdonald
Derounian	Machrowicz
Devereux	Mack, Wash.
Dies	Madden
Dixon	Mahon
Dolliver	Marshall
Dondero	Martin
Donohue	Mason
Dorn, N. Y.	Matthews
Dorn, S. C.	Metcalf
Durham	Miller, Calif.
Edmonson	Miller, Md.
Elliott	Miller, Nebr.
Evins	Mills
Fallon	Minshall
Fascell	Mollohan
Felgeman	Morano
Fenton	Moss

Williams, N. Y. Wolcott
 Willis Wolverton
 Wilson, Ind. Wright
 Whistead Yates

Young
 Younger
 Zablocki

NAYS—2

Bailey Harvey
 ANSWERING "PRESENT"—2
 Brownson Scrivner

NOT VOTING—114

Adair	Garmatz	Meader
Albert	Gathings	Merrow
Alexander	Granahan	Miller, N. Y.
Allen, Calif.	Gray	Morgan
Anfuso	Green, Pa.	Morrison
Barden	Gubser	Moulder
Barrett	Hagen	Mumma
Becker	Hale	Nelson
Billich	Halleck	O'Brien, N. Y.
Boland	Harrison, Nebr.	O'Konski
Bolton,	Heselton	Polk
Oliver P.	Hoeven	Powell
Bonner	Hoffman, Ill.	Quigley
Bosch	Holt	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Holtzman	Reed, N. Y.
Brooks, Tex.	Horan	Riehman
Buckley	Ikard	Rivers
Burdick	Jackson	Robison, Ky.
Byrne, Pa.	James	Roosevelt
Canfield	Johnson, Wis.	St. George
Chase	Jonas	Scherer
Chatham	Jones, Mo.	Schwengel
Davidson	Kean	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.
Denton	Kearns	Smith, Kans.
Diggs	Kee	Taylor
Dingell	King, Pa.	Teague, Tex.
Dodd	Klein	Thompson, La.
Dollinger	Knox	Thompson, Tex.
Donovan	Knutson	Utt
Dowdy	Laird	Vanik
Doyle	Lesinski	Van Pelt
Eberhardt	Lovre	Velde
Ellsworth	McConnell	Williams, N. J.
Engle	McGregor	Wilson, Calif.
Fino	McIntire	Withrow
Frelinghuysen	Mack, Ill.	Zelenko
Fulton	Magnuson	
Gamble	Maillard	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Halleck.
 Mrs. Billich with Mr. Fino.
 Mr. Klein with Simpson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Morrison with Reece of Tennessee.
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Nelson.
 Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Kean.
 Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. James.
 Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. Donovan with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Heselton.
 Mr. Powell with Mr. Canfield.
 Mr. Sheppard with Mr. McConnell.
 Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Miller of New York.
 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Gubser.
 Mr. Granahan with Mr. Holt.
 Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Horan.
 Mr. Morgan with Mr. Becker.
 Mr. Eberhardt with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Polk with Mr. Withrow.
 Mr. Denton with Mr. Van Pelt.
 Mr. Doyle with Mr. Taylor.
 Mr. Chatham with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Anfuso with Mrs. St. George.
 Mr. Albert with Mr. Riehman.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Fulton.
 Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.
 Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
 Mr. Williams of New Jersey with Mr. Hoeven.

Mr. Vanik with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
 Mr. Quigley with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Engel with Mr. Velde.
 Mr. Davidson with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Knutson with Mr. Gamble.
 Mrs. Kee with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Kearns.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Allen of California.

Mr. Ikard with Mr. McGregor.
 Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Maillard.
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. McIntire.
 Mr. Moulder with Mr. Lovre.
 Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Bosch.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Chase.

Mr. Brooks of Texas with Mr. Knox.

Mr. Boland with Mr. Laird.

Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Hagen with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Meader.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Gathings with Mr. Mumma.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Hale.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Kearney.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall No. 95 I was necessarily absent at the Pentagon. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 91 my colleague, Mr. JAMES, is recorded as having voted. On that day, he was in the hospital in Bethesda, and I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly to show that he was not present and did not vote.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. BROTHILL. Mr. Speaker, I understand that I was not recorded as voting on rollcall No. 95. I voted "yea" and ask unanimous consent that I be so recorded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

ELIZABETH KEE—WEST VIRGINIA'S DAUGHTER OF THE YEAR

(Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, in the June 17 issue of the White Sulphur Sentinel, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., Miss Pat Sullivan in her column "Saun-

terings" congratulates the State of West Virginia for having such an illustrious daughter as our colleague, the Honorable ELIZABETH KEE, Fifth District, West Virginia. I have known ELIZABETH as the wife of my good friend and former colleague, the late John Kee. I have known her as a vivacious woman and an active, sincere representative for her district.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks I include this article in the RECORD.

I plume myself I'm getting up in the world—on my acquaintance list are not only West Virginia's queenly royalty of festival days and the hermit of the Alleghenies, but I also claim acquaintance with the former West Virginia mother of the year, the beloved Mrs. Alex Thompson of Alderson. I count as my close friends a few people rich enough to be retired. But this "bla bla bla fanfare" is to tell you I also know West Virginia's daughter of the year. My gracious friend, the Honorable ELIZABETH KEE, of Bluefield, W. Va., and of the House of Representatives in Washington, D. C., received this distinct honor last May 7 when the West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia held its annual son-and-daughter banquet honoring West Virginia's outstanding son and daughter of the year 1955. Mrs. KEE was selected as our State's most distinguished daughter and she was presented with a beautiful plaque by a former Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Jennings Randolph. Just naturally letters and telegrams of applause poured into her mailbox from friends and acquaintances expressing their confidence and appreciation of her integrity and eminent service to her people. The Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD, of West Virginia, paid tribute to ELIZABETH KEE in appreciative poetic phrases that were written into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 10, 1955, plus letters like orchids from such bigwigs as Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Senator H. M. KNGORE, and GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho, and a half dozen others were applause in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for West Virginia's favorite daughter. Humbly I add my soprano cheers for my favorite politician. Once a year at least we meet at the State fairgrounds at Fairlea, W. Va. But where in heck were you last summer, ELIZABETH KEE? I missed you. I want to complain also about your pictures on the roadside billboards, because the pictures were not nearly so pretty as you are. Congratulations, Daughter of 1955, room 1016, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make certain correction in the RECORD at page A4001.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE TRAVEL EXPENSE ACT OF 1949

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6295) to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.